

By the same author:

Under the pen name Robert Black:

Workers Councils in the Hungarian Revolution, 1966
With L. Trotsky and B. Pearce, *A Moscow Trials Anthology*, 1967
With J. Crawford, *Conflicts in the Bolshevik Party in 1917*, 1967
The Ironies of Isaac Deutscher, 1967
Stalinism in Britain, 1970
The Fight for Bangladesh, 1971
Fascism in Germany 1975

Under his own name:

The Seeds of Evil, 1995
Through Frosted Glass, 2018

Socialism of Fools

The Rise and Fall of Comrade Corbyn

Part I

By Robin Blick

Published by New Generation Publishing in 2023

Copyright © Robin Blick 2019

Revised Seventh Edition

The author asserts the moral right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 to be identified as the author of this work.

All Rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means without the prior consent of the author, nor be otherwise circulated in any form of binding or cover other than that which it is published and without a similar condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-8036-9353-8

Hardback ISBN: 978-1-8036-9354-5

www.newgeneration-publishing.com



New Generation Publishing

This work is dedicated to the memory of Captain Alfred Dreyfus, whose unbroken spirit triumphed over the vilest prejudice known to mankind., and to Maureen, the love, light, joy and passion of my life, who shared in equal measure my loathing of anti-Semitism.

Swansea, 2022

‘Every man should think what he likes and say what he thinks.’ Baruch Spinoza,
Tractus-Theologicus, 1670

‘Let your reason furnish the answer.’ W. A. Mozart: *The Magic Flute*

‘I count religion but a childish toy, and hold there is no sin but ignorance.’
Christopher Marlowe, Prologue, *The Jew of Malta*

‘...the idea that an organisation [Hamas] that is dedicated towards the good of the Palestinian people and bringing about long-term peace and social justice and political justice in the whole region should be labelled a terrorist organisation by the British government is really a big, big mistake.’ (Jeremy Corbyn, March 3, 2009)

‘The Day of Judgment will not come about until Muslims fight the Jews, killing the Jews, when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees. The stones and trees will say, O Muslims O Abdullah, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him.’ (Hamas Covenant, Article 7)

‘There is no solution to the Palestinian question except through *Jihad*. Initiatives, proposals and international conferences are all a waste of time and vain endeavors.’ (Hamas Covenant, Article 13)

‘Even if the Zionist state was the size of a postage stamp, it would have no right to exist.’ (John McDonnell, Labour MP for Hayes and Harlington, Corbyn’s Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, 2015-2020.)

‘The dispersed Jews who would want to be re-assembled in the same community will find a sufficiently extensive and rich spot under the sun. The same possibility will be opened up for the Arabs, as for all other scattered nations’ (Leon Trotsky, January 18, 1937)

‘You may as you commence decide you see impiety therein
And that the path you enter is the avenue to sin.
More often, on the contrary, it is Religion breeds
Wickedness and that has given rise to wrongful deeds.’

Titus Lucretius Carus, *The Nature of Things*, circa BC 60

‘Mendelssohn was a Jew and Karl Marx and Spinoza
...your God was a Jew...Christ was a Jew like me.’

Leopold Bloom to an Irish Catholic Jew-baiter, in *Ulysses* by James Joyce.

‘In the proclamation of these principles [of freedom and equality] is unfurled the new, the latest standard round which the peoples rally – the banner of free spirit, independent thought finding its life in the truth, and enjoying independence only in it. This is the banner under which we serve, and which we bear.’

G.W.F. Hegel on the Reformation, in *The Philosophy of History*.

‘The Koran! Well, now put me to the test-
Lovely old book in hideous error drest-
Believe me, I can quote the Koran too,
The unbeliever knows his Koran best,’

Omar Khayyam, the *Rubaiyat*

‘Authentic [sic] Islam and a proper [sic] reading of the *Koran* are opposed to every [sic] form of violence.’

Pope Francis II.

‘Those that deny Our revelations We will burn in fire.’ *Koran* Chapter 4, Verse 56.

‘Islam is a peaceful and tolerant religion, and the acts of these people are contrary to the teachings of the *Koran*.’ UK Prime Minister Tony Blair on 9/11.

‘I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve.’ *Koran*, Chapter 8, Verse 13.

‘These acts of violence against innocents violate the fundamental tenets of the Islamic faith.’ US President George Bush on 9/11.

‘Those that make war on God and his apostle and spread disorder shall be put to death or crucified and have their hands and feet cut off on opposite sides.’ *Koran*, Chapter 5, Verse 34.

‘Islam is not the source of terrorism.’ German Chancellor Angela Merkel.

‘Verily we have prepared for disbelievers chains and iron collars and blazing fire.’ (*Koran*, Chapter 76, Verse 5)

‘...if they [the believers] turn back from Islam, take hold of them and kill them wherever you find them.’ *Koran*, Chapter 4, Verse 89.

‘Nowhere in the Koran does God command earthly authorities to execute anyone who has converted from Islam.’ Abed Awad, Religion Blogs CNN.

‘Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance.’ US President Barack Obama.

‘Muslims are peaceful and tolerant people and have nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism.’ US Secretary of State Hilary Clinton.

‘Every place you meet an Israeli, cut off his head.’

Sultan Abu Al Einein, Fatah Central Committee adviser to Palestine Authority President Mahmoud Abbas.

‘Israel has hypnotized the world; may God awaken the people and help them see the evil doings of Israel.’ Former KKK Grand Wizard and white supremacist David Duke on Twitter, February 9, 2019.

‘Israel had hypnotized the world; may Allah awaken the people and help them see the evil doings of Israel.’ BDS supporter and Democrat Congresswoman Ilhan Omar, on Twitter, November 16, 2012.

Contents

Preface.....	1
Prologue	81
Anti-Semitism...an attempt at a definition	85
1 Solidarity?	91
2 Enemies of Zion	108
3 To Beat or Not to Beat?.....	158
4 Disproportionate?.....	173
5 What Holocaust?	179
6 Mufti Meets Fuehrer	206
7 Hubris.....	238
8 Genocide...but whose?	244
9 Baby Killers...but whose babies?	263
10 Reformation?.....	276
11 Where the Penis Never Softens	298
12 Abrogation.....	317
13 Who's Left?	327
14 Jeremy the Tank Engine	341
15 Zeal.....	372
16 Goal!.....	377
17 Integration?	411
18 Eastern Magic	427
19 Do Not Disturb.....	437
20 Underneath the Arches	464
21 Orient	470
22 You Must Do It.....	497
23 Holy Hitmen.....	509

24 Normal	531
25 Spiked	541
26 Dump It!.....	551
27 Industry	578
28 Chicken	615
29 Lunacy	641
30 Exodus	646
Afterword: You are my Sunshine.....	663

Preface

In March 1941, socialists of various persuasions, among them George Orwell, united by their revulsion at Stalin's pact and subsequent collaboration with Hitler, produced the volume aptly titled *Betrayal of the Left*. Since the Al-Qaeda attacks of September 11, 2001, the West has witnessed a new betrayal of the left, one which in numerous ways, resembles that of August 23, 1939, namely the collaboration of some of its more radical tendencies and representatives with anti-Semitic, Jihadi Islam. Even those who are conversant with the ways of the left might find it difficult to comprehend how a movement could enter into such an alliance when it can trace its origins to a nineteenth century German Jew who famously pronounced that 'religion is the opium of the people.' And yet there are precedents.

Obeying directives from the Kremlin, for the duration of the Cold War, communist parties in the west sought out and enrolled prominent clerics in so-called 'peace movements', a policy whose real purpose was to weaken the west's ability to resist Soviet imperialism. While some clergyman drawn into the campaigns were simply dupes, Lenin's 'useful idiots', others were already fully committed to the cause, most notably in the UK the veteran Stalin apologist Hewlett Johnson, the Anglican 'Red Dean' of Canterbury, and the Methodist preacher Donald Soper. Stepping into their shoes in later years was another cleric, Roman Catholic Monsignor Bruce Kent, General Secretary of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament from 1980 to 1985, and subsequently a prominent member of the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign, whose founder and Patron was former Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn. Corbyn had been a CND activist since the age of 15 and in more recent years, its vice-chairman and then vice-president. Like their predecessors, neither self-styled 'peace campaigner' made any attempt to maintain even a pretence of a neutral stance during the Cold War, Kent declaring in 1985 that 'the culpability for the arms race is on the West', and likening a US communications centre in the UK to 'an SS concentration camp', while Corbyn, writing in the Communist Party's *Morning Star*, described NATO as 'an instrument of cold war manipulation' and, as a Labour MP, conducted a series of conversations with a Czech intelligence agent.

Like many of his generation on the left, while the experience must have been truly traumatic, the break-up of the Kremlin's East European empire in 1989, and demise of the Soviet Union itself two years later, had little if any effect upon Corbyn's loyalties and enmities. What is now the European Union was still 'the tool of US policy', and what in 1991 became just Russia was still the innocent victim of NATO expansionism. (See Appendix XIV) What was new was Corbyn's burgeoning commitment to a new cause that could in part at least compensate for the decline of Russia as a world super power - Arab nationalism, and with it, as we shall see, an ever-deeper involvement in the murky worlds of Palestinian anti-Zionism and Islamic Jihadism.

Though every-ready to sing the praises of the faith, and one regime in particular ruled by it, Iran, Corbyn stopped short of actual conversion. However, in the French Communist Party ideologue Roger Garaudy, even more so than Corbyn, we had surely the most spectacular personification of the historical linkage between these two phases of what is essentially the same strategy, namely the undermining of

western liberal democracy, the first in an alliance with secular totalitarianism, and then with its successor, one that is grounded in Islamic theology. A member of the ultra-Stalinist party's Central Committee, and Deputy in the French National Assembly, between 1967 and 1977, Garaudy produced no fewer than five books setting out the case for what was termed a 'Christian-Communist Dialogue', the precursor to today's no less fatuous and doomed 'Christian-Muslim Dialogue', each being one in which the regimes of one of the participants were known to be persecuting and, in the case of Islam, even murdering brethren of the other. Then in 1982 came Garaudy's conversion, though not as one might have expected to Christianity, but to...Islam.

His literary talents now found a new outlet, namely Holocaust denial, anti-Semitism and a visceral hatred for the state of Israel. Sharing the same Neo-Nazi publisher as fellow anti-Zionist campaigner Noam Chomsky (of which more in due course), Garaudy's *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel* (1991) won the unstinting praise of prominent leaders in the Muslim world for its claim to have exposed the 'myth of the six million Jews'. Muhammad Gaddafi, paymaster of both the *soi-disant* Trotskyist Workers Revolutionary Party and Ken Livingstone's long-defunct weekly journal *Labour Herald*, lauded the book's author as 'Europe's greatest philosopher since Plato and Aristotle'. The work also won the approval of one of Jeremy Corbyn's anti-Semitic terrorist 'friends', the Hezbollah chief Hassan Nasrallah, who claimed that Garaudy had exposed the lie of the 'alleged Jewish Holocaust in Germany', while Ali Khamenei, the 'Supreme Leader' of the Iranian theocracy, praised the book for exposing the 'Nazi-like behaviour of the Zionists', a trope that has proliferated on websites venerating Labour's former Leader.

One of Khamenei's many responsibilities was to appoint the head of Iran's state-owned, London-based English language *Press TV* channel. Since opening in 2007, the channel's political agenda has been defined by those who it has featured either as guests or presenters, including three anti-Zionists from the far left, George Galloway, Ken Livingstone and Jeremy Corbyn, who shared duties with a wide variety of anti-Zionists from the far right, including at least four Holocaust-deniers, a German Neo-Nazi, a 9/11-denying Vicar, a Hitler (and Corbyn)-admiring former KKK Grand Wizard and a promotor of the *Protocols of Zion*. In due course, Corbyn would beat a path to Tehran and to its Shi'a ally in Damascus, to be followed there, three times by Nick Griffin, one-time *Fuehrer* of the neo-Nazi British National Party, in June 2013 as part of a delegation that included far right representatives from Russia, Belgium and Poland. Other visitors have included leaders of neo-fascist movements from Italy (CasaPound), Poland (National Rebirth) and Greece (Golden Dawn). In all, an otherwise disparate crew, united only by their enmity for what in such company often goes by the name of 'the Zionist entity'. How and why is one of the central themes of this book.

I began writing it on the day in December 2015 that United Nations refugee officials reported that fourteen million refugees, nearly all of them Muslims, had been driven from their homes, not by the Jews or 'western imperialism', but by civil wars raging in the Middle East and North Africa between armies, militias and mobs professing what in polite society is known as the Religion of Peace. Islam was inflicting on the Arabs what its Nazi secular analogue visited on Germany and the rest of Europe, laying their lands waste by bringing death, flight, chaos, persecution, misery and destruction to countless millions. By February 2016, half of Syria's population of 23 million had fled their homeland, while civilian deaths

had climbed above a quarter of a million. All this passed without any comment, let alone condemnation from those who are always ready to accuse Israel when it defends itself from attacks by Islamic terrorists whose avowed aim is the extermination of the Jews. Within the battle zones, hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, had been subjected to ordeals and humiliations not witnessed on our planet since the end of the Second World War...enslavement, rape, torture, forcible conversions to Islam, massacres, beheadings, crucifixions, burning and burying alive. In the face of such evidence, it would seem a redundant, even ridiculous exercise to have to argue that though there are in the world today incontestably at least two religions of peace, Jainism and Quakerism, Islam is not one of them. And yet, since 9/11, after each massacre and atrocity committed in its name, the infidel public has been bombarded by politicians and Christian clerics with the assertion that Islam is indeed not only a religion of peace, but *the* religion of peace. This is a lie, and those who tell it surely know it.

The holy texts of Islam, in the first place the *Koran*, prove beyond the least shadow of doubt that Islam is not a religion of peace, but more than any other, one of war and conquest. (See Appendix L) However, the beliefs practised by the Quakers, or as they call themselves, the 'Society of Friends', definitely are worthy of this description. And although sworn to total non-violence, unlike the followers of Islam, they have nevertheless been to the forefront in numerous struggles for social justice, freedom and toleration, and by ignoring their holy book, something which as yet most Muslims are either not prepared or free to do, led the campaign for the abolition of slavery while other Christians, together with Muslims, were growing rich on its proceeds. Quakers were ready to suffer persecution and even to die for their beliefs, but again, unlike other Christians and Muslims, were never prepared to kill for them. Unlike Quakerism, Jainism has no personal god. This it shares with Buddhism, both of which originated in 6th century BC India. Jainism takes non-violence and respect for life to such a degree that in accordance with one of its holy texts, 'all breathing, existing, living, sentient creatures should not be slain, not treated with violence, nor abused, not tormented, nor driven away. This is the pure, unchangeable eternal law.' (*Akaranga Sutra, IV: Lesson 1*) Now the Religion of Peace: 'I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Smite above the necks and smite off all finger tips.' (*Koran*, Chapter 8, Verse 13. I will be using several approved English translations of the *Koran* whose numbering systems slightly vary. The editors of this particular translation thoughtfully supplemented this verse with a footnote explaining how 'the upper part of the neck which is just below the head' is 'considered to be the most vulnerable for dealing an effective blow with the sword'.)

At this work's outset, let me make two things very clear. First, that my quarrel is not with Muslims *per se*, but with Islam, a distinction so-called 'hate crime' laws, definitions of 'Islamophobia' (See Chapter 28) and the politically correct find it hard, if not impossible to draw. A critique of Islam is directed at an idea, and not at those who of their own free will (so we are told) choose to believe and to act on it to one degree or another. Such a critique requires that just like secular beliefs and opinions, those of Muslims should not be protected from criticism by criminal laws, any more than they should be subjected to laws curtailing their free expression. By the same token, all that should be asked of diaspora Muslims, as of anyone else, is that they obey the laws of the land they live in, pay their way by honest work, while remaining free, if they so choose, to believe in and practise Islam, insofar as the

latter does not conflict with the law. In other words, 'when in Rome'. And contrary to the doubly illegal 'open door' migrant policy pursued by German Chancellor Angela Merkel (doubly, because it contravenes both German and EU asylum law, See Addendum to Appendix D), I believe that Muslims genuinely fleeing persecution or danger to their lives should be treated exactly the same as anyone else in the same situation, neither being given special favours nor suffering any discrimination on account of their religious beliefs. And throughout this work, I have tried not to lose sight of the fact that what the West has suffered in recent years at the hands of Islamic terrorism, horrendous though it is, is dwarfed both in scale and pervasiveness by the miseries inflicted on countless millions of Muslims by those of their own faith over the fourteen centuries of its existence, especially its womenfolk.

I nevertheless reserve and frequently exercise the right to criticise the conduct of individual diaspora Muslims, (as indeed do a number of prominent reformist Muslims, some of whom I quote in this work) when, in the pursuance of their faith as it is defined in its fundamental texts, such conduct is either unlawful or does not conform to what the West generally regards as civilised behaviour. In these categories for example I include not only wife-beating, marital rape, child marriage and female genital mutilation, but anti-Semitism, terrorist atrocities, the pre-planned mass sex assaults unleashed across Europe on New Year's Eve of 2015, and in the UK, the pimping gangs which ply their sordid trade in towns and cities across England. Secondly, this being a matter to which I will have cause to return on several occasions, Islam is not a race but a religion, and that therefore, contrary to the claims of Muslim pressure groups and the politically correct, while hostility towards non-white Muslims may well be in given instances motivated by xenophobia or racism, a reasoned and factually-based criticism of Islam such as I undertake in this work is not. The subject of my inquiry has nothing to do with genes and skin colours, but certain beliefs which are both shared and rejected by people of all races, and these beliefs' many consequences. Dishonest attempts to associate such a criticism of Islam with racism (See Chapter 28) are simply a means to shut down any serious debate about the merits or otherwise of the world's second largest and, due to demographic factors but not conversions as some claim, fastest-growing religion. I leave it to the reader to speculate as to the motives of those who find it necessary to adopt this strategy. Yet all I ask for is that the right to criticise a belief should be equal in society and before the law to the right to hold and advocate it. By way of an example: If someone in high office is accused of a serious dereliction of duty, what he or she believes in, whether it be religious or otherwise, insofar as it has no bearing on the case, will be of no more interest to me than their race or gender, just as it should not be to anyone else. But if a man charged with beating or raping his wife, mutilating his daughter or committing an act of terror, claims that his belief system entitles him to do so, for reasons that should not require stating, those beliefs do concern me, as they should everyone else, and to subject them to the closest possible scrutiny is therefore in no sense discriminatory, but rather a public duty.

Except for updating required by subsequent events, I completed most of the main body of this text in Easter Week 2016, the week that an Islamic State suicide squad randomly massacred 35 civilians and wounded 300 more in Brussels, and reports reached the west that a Roman Catholic priest held captive by the Islamic State had been crucified on Good Friday. As regards the later atrocity, the current

Pope had more than once spoken of his conviction that Islam is a peaceful and tolerant faith. He could not have read Chapter 5, Verse 34, of the *Koran*, which specifies exactly the punishment that may have been meted out to one of his own clergy: 'The only reward of those who wage war on Allah and his Messenger' is 'that they be slain or crucified or their hands and feet be cut off'. Rounding off that particular week came another massacre, when a suicide bomber linked to the Islamic State blew himself up in a park in Lahore, Pakistan, leaving 72 dead and 300 wounded, among them scores of children. All the victims were Christians celebrating Easter. Yet even as the leaders and peoples of the civilised world condemned these atrocities and mourned their victims, millions of Pakistani Muslims continued to honour and mourn Mumtaz Qadri, executed only days previously for murdering in 2011 the governor of the Punjab, Salmaan Taseer, who had publicly defended a Christian labourer falsely accused of breaking Pakistan's blasphemy laws.

It is hard now to recall a time when news bulletins did not feature accounts of crimes committed in the name of the 'religion of peace', and reports of the seemingly never-ending stream of migrants and refugees (as we shall see, the distinction is important) fleeing the fear, misery and poverty that it generates. Yet in the west, where they are free to make their opinions known, not only was there no organised protest by Muslims against the sufferings inflicted by Muslims on their co-religionist. Instead, thousands of young Muslims, women as well as men, continued to make their way to Syria, eager to participate in the fratricidal slaughter. Some who have commented on the upsurge of Islamic terrorism have argued that the religion is being 'used' by cynical politicians to enhance their power in the Muslim world, and to force concessions from an intimidated west. Those who adopt this line of reasoning are then easily led to the conclusion, which I hold to be utterly false, that despite its being a key tenant of Islam, Jihadism is not essentially a religious phenomenon, but one emanating from, and therefore to be combatted within, the sphere of conventional politics. This argument falls at the first hurdle. The point has been well made in this context that there is no sense in pulling a lever unless it moves something at the other end in the desired direction. 'Using' religion requires that those to be used by it believe in it, to the extent in the case of Islam that countless of its 1.5 billion faithful have by their deeds proved they are ready to kill and die for their god. So even if every one of their leaders summoning them to Jihad were to prove to be secret atheists, an absurd proposition, the results would still be the same. The commands Jihadis obey are in a book they believe is the undiluted word of their god. The idea that 'using religion' is somehow alien to religion, especially when invoked to explain away Muslim terrorism as essentially a secular affair, is indeed a strange concept, because religion is meant to be 'used' for purposes that are themselves purely religious, though their secondary consequences will obviously impinge on matters that are not.

Religious teachings are seen by those that disseminate and accept them to have eminently useful purposes, one of which is to enable people to live a life pleasing to their god or gods, and another to create here on earth a community of believers which, by obeying god's laws, will earn its members rewards in heaven. For those that believe this, nothing could be more 'useful'. That is why for Muslims 'doing god's work' takes on such a violent character, because integral to this 'work', as the *Koran* has it in verse 194 of Chapter 2, is waging Jihad until 'religion is professed only for Allah'. And that is why this 'work' has to continue even, or rather

especially, in Islam's 'Holy Month'. On June 12, 2016, with Ramadan less than a week old, a young Muslim of Afghan parentage armed with a recently purchased semi-automatic weapon killed 49 homosexuals and wounded 53 more in a gay night club in Orlando, Florida. The next day, in Paris, another young Muslim, crying 'God is great', stabbed to death a French police commander and his partner at their home in Manganville, north of Paris. Both killers were known to the police for their Jihadist sympathies, and both had announced their allegiance to the Islamic State. On the same day, with Ramadan still only in its first week, a severed head in a plastic bag was found close by a Catholic Church on the southern Philippines island of Jolo. The head was that of Robert Hall, who had been kidnapped, along with three others, in September 2015 by Abu Sayyaf, an organisation that has pledged its loyalty to the Islamic State. All this in just two days, in the first week of the holy month of Ramadan, the month in which, according to Islamic tradition, the *Koran* was revealed to Mohammed, with its oft-repeated injunction to subdue, by any means necessary, the enemies of Allah. Only a few hours before the Orlando massacre, peace campaigner Jeremy Corbyn had offered his own special slant on Ramadan. It was 'a month of mercy, forgiveness and freedom. At the heart of your faith lie the values of peace, responsibility and humanity.' What world was he living in? Did he not ever read a newspaper? Turn on his smart phone or television? Read his *Koran*?

After yet another atrocity committed by Muslims in the name of Islam, the massacre in Paris on the evening of November 13, 2015, of 130 civilians by eight Islamic State Jihadis, Democrat Presidential front runner Hilary Clinton, taking her cue from current incumbent Obama, could hardly wait to assure the world that 'Muslims have nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism'. '*Nothing whatsoever*'? If Al-Qaeda Muslims were not the perpetrators of 9/11, who were? Unwittingly, she lent credence to exponents of conspiracy theorists of left and right who saw in 9/11 either the hand of Mossad or President Bush, or even both. Let us be charitable by not insulting her intelligence, and assume she was lying, that she did not believe this absurd proposition. So why then say it, especially when there were Muslims who were not prepared to do so? Like Abdul Ahmed Rashid, a Saudi columnist for the Pan Arab journal *Al Sharq al Wasat*: 'It is a certain fact that not all Muslims are terrorists. But it is equally certain, and exceptionally painful, that almost all terrorist are Muslims'...a clear case of 'Islamophobic hate speech'. And yet privately, Clinton agreed. In a memo to John Podesta, her Presidential campaign manager, dating from 2014, she had written the following: 'We need to use our diplomatic and more traditional intelligence assets to bring pressure to bear on the governments of Qatar and Saudi Arabia, which are providing clandestine financial and logistical support to ISIL and other [n.b.] radical Sunni groups in the region.' 'Muslims have nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism'...yet here was Clinton saying Saudi and Qatari Muslims were providing 'financial and logistical support' to their brother Muslims of the 'radical Sunni' Islamic State. Some political commentators suggested that Hilary Clinton's public state of denial on the connection between Islam and terrorism could have at least in part been explained by the huge sums donated to the Clinton Foundation by Arab monarchies that had atrocious human rights records and in at least two cases, as the above memo asserts, had themselves been accused of funding terrorist movements and activities. The regimes that helped to fund Clinton's failed bid for Presidency included Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates. Just to make sure such sensitive information was

kept under wraps, in 2016, the year of the Presidential campaign, the Saudis paid Podesta's brother Tony, a Washington lobbyist, \$140,000 per month. He who pays the piper...

There was also another factor that played its part in shaping the Democratic Party leadership's pusillanimous reaction to the challenge of Islamic terrorism, and as a result, contributed to Clinton's defeat by Trump, and that is the felt need, which of course it shared with its Republican rivals, to pander to the large majority of US voters who are, to one degree or another, religious. True, with each election, their share of the total electorate falls (currently some 30% of the US population defines itself as non-religious) but the influence of organised religion on US politics at every level, although in decline, was still substantial enough to convince party leaders that whatever their private views in matters of faith, they had to pretend that every voter was religious or run the very real risk of being denounced as a closet atheist. Criticising even the smallest aspect of any religion was and still is regarded, almost certainly correctly, as committing political suicide. Even so, especially in view of the fact that in the USA, religion and state are totally separated under the First Amendment, that does not place political leaders under an obligation to say things about Islam that they must surely know are not true, as both Obama and Hilary Clinton had done. As a result, Trump, despite his many well-advertised misdemeanours, not only retained the allegiance of the evangelicals, he made substantial inroads into the Democratic white working-class vote, due at least partly, I suspect, not only to Clinton's taking their support for granted, but to her and her President's well-advertised stance on Islamic terrorism, highlighted by Obama's abject state of denial after the Orlando massacre.

Like John Donne's man, no religion is an island. Superstition can diminish to the point of death even those who do not share it. What began as the most convulsive crisis in the history of Islam forced its way into the heartlands of the western world by way of terrorism and mass Muslim migration. The Merkel-generated anti-migrant reaction that had already rolled across Europe, driving millions of voters to back candidates who on this single issue were delivering a message no other politician dared utter, and in all probability helping to tip the scales in favour of the UK voting to leave the EU, even lapped the shores of the United States, helping to sweep into the White House an ignorant, bigoted, isolationist, maverick billionaire whom virtually every unbiased political commentator had initially dismissed as a buffoon. Clinton, who quite possibly believed that appeasing Islamic supremacism would gain her a political advantage by securing the Muslim vote (approximately three million) had only herself to blame for her catastrophic defeat by failing, after 9/11, to confront openly the threat of Islamic terrorism.

Then there was the international dimension. To take but one example of many; her declaration, delivered in Washington to 30 government and international organisation representatives in December 2011. She was speaking in support of a United Nations Human Rights Council resolution promoted by its Muslim members, the purpose of which was to make it binding on all UN member states to criminalise criticism of religion (with Islam patently in mind), a law which in the case of the USA, would violate its own free speech First Amendment...hardly a vote winner except among the politically correct elites. Clinton's speech rested on two presumptions: religion is inherently good, and all mankind is inherently religious. By then conflating freedom of religion with a spurious right for it to be free from criticism, she arrived at the conclusion that attacks on religion needed to

be prevented because: 'For people everywhere, faith and religious practice is a central part of our [sic] identity. It provides our [sic] lives with meaning and context. It is fundamental to who we [sic] are'. Even in the Islamic world, where for obvious reasons, doubts and disbelief are thoughts one keeps to oneself, there is evidence this is no longer the case. As for the western world, this assertion is sheer fantasy. Even in her own country, and far more so again in Europe, religious observance, save for that of Muslims, is in virtual free fall. There was an alternative perspective to Clinton's on the link between Islam and terror, if only those who should have been listening had been prepared to give it the consideration it deserved. Following the 2016 Bastille Day Nice massacre, this is what that *bête noir* of the Sharia left and the UK's Muslim establishment, Maajid Nawaz of the reformist Quilliam Foundation, had to say in reply to those who, like Hilary Clinton, sought to deny the existence of any connection between such atrocities and his own religion:

Your good intentions towards us Muslims are only making the problem worse. This is as dangerous as saying it has everything to do with Islam. The Crusaders were not pious. But they had something to do with Christianity, right? Now switch out [replace] white Christians with brown Muslims and kindly cease with this bigotry of low expectations. This has something to do with Islam...please stop denying the nature of Jihadism. Please stop ignoring the narratives which drive these attacks.

Like Nawaz, I readily grant that like all events and processes in history, the crimes perpetrated by Jihadi Muslims have multiple causes. But their common and prime denominator is an unquestioning and literally all-consuming devotion to their religion, one that perpetrators of atrocities proclaim even at their moment of self-immolation, with the cry of *Allahu Akbar*, God is Great. The tragedy is that Maajid's was a voice in a wilderness of Islamophilia. Interviewed in the wake of the Nice massacre, a Belgium Muslim, like the majority of those in the diaspora who share his faith and politicians who do not, claimed that those responsible 'were not Muslims'. Islam was 'a religion of peace and love. It has nothing to do with what those people have done'. Nothing? Like Abdul Rashid, Nawaz disagreed. Jihadis mean what they say, and what they say and do comes from their religion. In the search for other explanations than religion for acts of terrorism, some have alighted upon mental illness. A small selection of many such instances must suffice. Reporting on a stabbing in Strasbourg on August,19, 2016, the BBC online news item said the following:

Police arrested the suspected attacker, who was heard shouting '*Allahu Akbar*, ("God is great"). A police source says he [the victim] was in distinctive Jewish dress. His life is not believed to be in danger. Local police told BBC News the attack was "not terrorist related". According to the police source quoted by AFP news agency, the suspected attacker had a history of mental illness.

I should add that Jews comprise 5% of the Strasbourg population, which makes the odds of this being a purely random attack 20 to one against the victim being a Jew. The same BBC report re-cycled a story already *at third hand*, via a tweet by a French crime journalist who had in turn heard it from 'a source close to [sic] the inquiry', that that 'no-anti-Semitic motive had yet been established'. A Muslim picks out and closes in on a man in traditional Jewish dress, stabs him, cries 'God

is Great' in Arabic...but Strasburg Jews, you can relax, there was 'no-anti-Semitic motive'...just bad luck. And more good news...neither was the attack 'terrorist related'. But we do have mental illness. So...a matter for a shrink, not the CNRTL, France's counter-terrorist unit..

On October 3, 2019, at the Paris Police Prefecture, four of its staff were stabbed to death and a fifth wounded by one of their colleagues, who was then shot and killed. The initial response of both the police union and government officials was once again to exclude the possibility that the crime could have been religiously motivated, even though there were reports in the media that the assassin had recently converted to Islam. The killings had either been triggered by 'work-related issues' or, yes...mental health problems. A police search of his computer and mobile phone quickly revealed his real motive, which was purely religious. He had been visiting the websites of the Islamic State and al-Qaeda, and on the morning of the attacks, had texted more than thirty Islamic messages to his wife, including God is Great, the ritual prelude to an act of Jihadi martyrdom. Shortly after arriving at the Prefecture, he slipped out to buy two huge knives, returned to work and set about his holy mission. When these facts became known, his work colleagues revealed that the assassin had made no secret of his Jihadi sympathies, and had even expressed support for the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre, but were afraid to report him for fear being accused of racism and Islamophobia. Let us pause and reflect for moment. These opinions were openly advertised not only by a member of staff at a police station in a city and country that had been the repeated target of attacks by Islamic terrorists, but one who was working in its intelligence (sic) section, of whose duties *one was the monitoring of terrorist threats*. Police discovered at his home a USB stick containing personal details of his work colleagues. Once again, political correctness came at a price, as we shall see it also did in Rotherham and Cologne.

A similar scenario was acted out on August 24, 2016, in a back-packers' hostel in Townsville, Queensland, Australia. Two British back-packers, a man and a woman, were killed, and another man injured, by a knife-wielding attacker, Smail Ayad, described by police as of French nationality. Despite numerous witnesses hearing him cry '*Allahu Akbar*', and a dead dog also being found at the scene (Muslims hate dogs), a police spokesman stated that 'this is not about race or religion. It is individual criminal behaviour.' True, only one 'individual' did the stabbing, and murder is indeed 'criminal behaviour'. But how does that rule out 'race or religion' as possible motives? To further confuse matters, according to another police report, 'all motivations were being considered, criminal and political, as well as the impact of drugs and mental health problems.' All motivations, that is, except Islam. If TV crime series are anything to go by (and many of them rely on professional advice to ensure realism) when it comes to motive, the list includes, in no particular order of frequency, financial gain of one kind or another, gang rivalry, politics, sexual jealousy, family feuding, drugs and mental illness. Law enforcement agencies and new media have also had more than two decades to familiarise themselves with a newcomer to this list, Islam. If they are to be taken at face value, public statements like the above, and other examples from the world of drama and news media cited in this work, it would seem to indicate that the adjustment to the world of Jihadi terrorism has yet to be accomplished. Seasoned journalists can act (because it is an act) just as dumb as police. When a would-be suicide bomber's bomb failed to explode in a crowded church in Indonesia, and he had to content

himself with attacking the officiating priest with an axe, an Associated Press report ran thus: 'The motive for the attack at the Roman Catholic St. Yosef Church in Medan, the capital of North Sumatra Province, was not clear, but the perpetrator carried a symbol indicating support for the Islamic State group.' 'Not clear'? What more did he have to do to advertise his allegiance and therefore his motive? We continue. The same day, August 26, 2016, in neighbouring Australia a man staged an acid attack on a Sydney gay and bisexual night club, the same venue that had been attacked three years previously by two armed Muslim men. By now the reader should be able to write the script for the police spokesman, who in a statement on the arrest of the acid attacker, claimed there was 'no indication of hate motive to date'. An acid attack on gays, and there was no hate? And this was only days after Orlando.

With the 15th anniversary of 9/11 imminent, only those suffering from 'mental health issues', or who had imbibed a lethal overdose of political correctness producing the same symptoms, would not have anticipated at least the possibility of an attempt at a repeat performance somewhere in the USA, and most probably, in New York's Manhattan. Sure enough, on Saturday, September 16, a pipe bomb exploded in New Jersey on the route of a charity run shortly due to take place. The run was in support of military veterans and their families, and the bomb was similar to the device planted by two Chechen Muslims which killed three spectators and wounded 260 at the 2013 Boston Marathon. As to the motive, a New Jersey law enforcement officer said 'we don't know whether it was criminal or terroristic'. A charity run for US military veterans? In the same week as the anniversary of 9/11? Yes, it was 'criminal'. But for what purpose? Hours later, five similar bombs were discovered at a New Jersey train station. Presumably, these too could have been the work of the same 'criminals', not terrorists.

Official denial and the presumption of public gullibility was also the order of the day in New York when the next day another bomb exploded on a street outside a building in the Chelsea district of Manhattan, wounding 29 pedestrians. On the same day, in St. Cloud, Minnesota, police shot dead a 21-year-old Muslim, Tahir Adan, after he stabbed nine passers-by in a shopping mall. He was heard crying out 'Allah' and before stabbing his victim, asking if they were Muslims. Following the Manhattan bombing, New York Mayor Bill de Blasio 'ruled out any terror connections', preferring instead to describe the explosion as 'an intentional act'. This told an anxious public nothing. Most 'acts' are 'intentional', including the planting of a bomb. The question was, what was the intention of the act? New York Governor Andrew Cuomo provided the correct answer. The explosion was 'obviously [sic] an act of terrorism'. At last! And so it proved. The next day, after a shootout in New Jersey that left two police wounded, Afghan-born Ahmad Khan Rahami was taken into custody as a suspect for both the New Jersey and Manhattan bombings. Yet more absurdly, Hilary Clinton rebuked Presidential rival Donald Trump for describing the device that caused the Manhattan explosion as 'a bomb' and not a 'pipe bomb'. Apparently, a pipe bomb is not a bomb, at least when set off by a Muslim. Running her a close second, as one might expect, was President Obama, with his fatuous insistence that 'at this point we [the Presidential plural?] see no connection' between the attacks in Minnesota and those in New Jersey and Manhattan. 'No connection'? Excepting, of course the small detail that they were each the work of Muslims and occurred within hours of each other in the week of the 15th anniversary of 9/11, which also, so we are assured, had 'no connection' with Islam, excepting that it was also the

work of Muslims. To cap it all, it transpired that Khan Rahami's father informed the FBI back in 2014 that his son was 'really bad', being prone to extreme violence. The FBI's response to this warning had been to pronounce the Manhattan bomber 'clean'. But then it gets worse. A matter of days after the bombings (if Hilary Clinton will permit) details emerged in the media concerning the bomber's Jihadi background, proving yet again how deeply Obama's political correctness had permeated his country's internal security institutions, sapping their ability and even willingness to counter an Islamic terrorist threat when it was staring them in the face. And this was after 9/11. During a visit to Pakistan in 2013, Rahman had posted on social media, easily accessible by US security agencies, a photo of himself in an aggressive pose, with the message: 'I bring the men who desire death as much as you desire life'. A year later, ignoring the warning from his father, and instead acting according to Obama's unshakable delusion that Islam is a religion of peace, Rahman was declared 'clean'. His sister Aziza had also been active in the same cause. She had posted a message consisting of a quotation from a Muslim cleric expounding the necessity of theocracy: 'The law of Allah should not be voted over. To give the people the choice whether to apply the Shari'a or not reflects a fundamental problem in the understanding of Tawheed.' (*Tahweed* is undivided devotion to Allah.) Rahami's brother Mohammad Khan had also posted pro-Jihadi messages. In all, quite a family. But 'clean'.

As we shall see, the UK has suffered in the same way from a refusal to call Islamic terrorism by its true name, and in this respect, the BBC is one of the worst offenders. Imagine we are back in the early 1940s. Britain, together with the rest of the Allies, is at war with Nazi Germany. The Holocaust is in full swing, and a journalist from neutral Sweden has somehow managed to bribe an Auschwitz SS guard to allow him to witness a gassing of a batch of newly arrived Jews. His report, accurate in every gruesome detail, appears anonymously in the Swedish press, which is of course closely monitored by British intelligence. So the account is filtered through various official channels to the BBC, which for the occasion is staffed by employees teleported from today's Corporation. Apprehensive of accusations of Naziphobia by pacifists, Mosleyites and the like, their version of events runs thus:

According to a report from an undisclosed source, somewhere in Poland, men wearing black leather uniforms with swastika armbands and brandishing whips were seen driving, to cries of '*schnell, schnell*', large numbers of Jewish women, some carrying babies, together with children and men, into what appeared to be a large shower room. The doors were then locked. At first there was loud screaming, then whimpering. After about fifteen minutes, all was quiet. The doors were opened, and a team of Jewish men dragged bodies out with hooks and transported them on carts to a nearby crematorium, where, before being burned, the corpses were searched for concealed valuables and gold teeth, which were removed. The BBC understands from a confidential source that there is no reason to suppose that this incident, though certainly an intentional criminal act, was motivated by anti-Semitism. Some attribute it to Hitler's mental instability. [As indeed will veteran leftist Ken Livingstone some seven decades later.]

Drugs, mental problems, sheer hate of nothing in particular, a lovers' tiff, unrequited love that necessitates the killing of not only a woman but another man and a dog, motiveless criminality, these and other no more plausible explanations

have been routinely touted as motives for umpteen acts of terror committed by Muslims, explanations that the public no less than those who put them into circulation knows full well are a pack of lies. Pride of place however for an alternative explanation for the upsurge in Jihadi violence must surely go to the unlikely duo of pop singer turned freelance Corbynite pundit Charlotte Church and the ultra-conservative Islamophilic crank and at that time, king-in-waiting Prince Charles, who both attributed the flood of Muslims into Europe, not to the civil wars raging within Islam and a more general failure and crisis of societies governed by it, but...global warming. One can at least agree that Islamic terror is global, but it is driven not by the weather, but *theology*, as with the murder of five Bangladeshi atheists, hacked to death by Muslims convinced they were acting in defence of their faith. As we shall see, Islamic theology, not Israel, is also the main reason why a special venom is reserved for Mohammed's first victims, the Jews. In Brussels, four Jews were murdered at the city's Jewish Museum by a gunman claiming allegiance to ISIS. In Copenhagen, a Jewish security guard was killed, again by a Muslim gunman, outside the synagogue he was protecting. In France, yet another Muslim assassin killed a rabbi and three children at a Jewish school in Toulouse. Three Israel Jews were hunted and killed by an Islamic State suicide bomber in an Istanbul street. 'Global warming'...or visceral anti-Semitism?

Then of course, there is always the mere existence of the 'Zionist entity' to not only explain but legitimise such crimes. During the Gaza conflict of 2014, for the first time since the anti-Dreyfus riots of more than a century previously, huge, violent mobs, comprised mainly of Muslims and Sharia leftists, but also with the participation of Neo-Nazis, took to the streets of Europe to vent their hatred not just of Israel, but of all things Jewish, on at least one occasion, chanting 'Hamas, Hamas, Jews to the gas'. In France, 7,000 troops were mobilised to protect Jews, synagogues and Jewish schools from attack by Muslims following the murder of four Jews by a Muslim gunmen in a Paris kosher supermarket on January 7, 2015. This was in addition to a more general assault on all unbelievers, as on the evening of November 13, 2015, again in Paris, the city the Islamic State derided after the killings as the 'capital of prostitution and obscenity', when a team of Muslim terrorists crying 'God is great' unleashed a series of co-ordinated attacks on a Jewish-owned concert hall, two restaurants, a bar and a football stadium, murdering 130 mainly youthful civilians and wounding 352. This was followed on March 22, 2016, by a double massacre by Islamic State Jihadis in a Brussels metro station and in the city's airport, killing 34 and wounding another 300.

Clarifying matters as to motive, a statement by the Islamic State described the Paris massacre as a 'blessed attack on crusader France' for its participation in the war, such as it was, against the Islamic State. As if taking its cue from this message, the response of the Socialist Workers Party front, the 'Stop the War Coalition' headed, until his election as Labour Party Leader, by its founder and Patron, Jeremy Corbyn, claimed that the 'Paris attacks [were] reaping the whirlwind of western support for extremism [sic] in the Middle East'. The 'extremists' were not, as one might reasonably assume, the Islamic State but the western-supported forces resisting it. The Coalition went further, describing the 'movement that spawned Daesh [ISIS]' as one of 'solidarity with oppressed Muslims', which it likened to the spirit of 'internationalism and solidarity' that motivated thousands of leftists to volunteer to fight against Franco's fascism in the Spanish Civil War. That tradition did indeed live on, not with the Jihadi Johns, the hired assassins of the

clerical fascist Islamic State, but with those such as Dean Evans and Erik Scurfield, who gave their lives as volunteers in the ranks of Kurdish freedom fighters battling to liberate their homeland from the scourge of Islamic theocracy. Derided by the Socialist Workers Party as 'western pawns', in October 2019, the Kurds were also betrayed by President Trump when he announced the withdrawal of all US forces from north Syria, leaving the way open for the Turkish army to ratchet up its decades-old war against Israel's only ally in the Middle East.

In July 2021, US President Joe Biden and UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson replicated Trump's Kurdish Munich in a synchronised withdrawal of their last remaining forces in Afghanistan. It was approved by Labour Shadow Foreign Secretary Lisa Nandy in a posting on her website. Rather than submit peacefully to their allotted role under the Taliban of rape fodder, domestic beasts of burden and, as the Hamas Covenant puts it, 'factories of men', teenage girls and young women took up arms abandoned by their menfolk, many of whom headed for the nearest airport. When the fate that awaited Afghan women under the rule of the Taliban announced itself to the world, it did so without so much as a whisper of protest, let alone cry of outrage, from Anglo-Saxon feminists, embroiled as they were in the far more pressing question of whether *homo sapiens* with penises should take part in women's events at the Olympic Games then in progress in Tokyo.

Already, Biden and Johnson had received ample warning of the consequences of their pull-out with reports such as the following, which reached the West in April 2021. A woman had been convicted by a Taliban court in Herat of talking to a man on her mobile phone. The punishment, 40 lashes, was witnessed by an all-male audience of hundreds. Following the UK/US withdrawal, reports of such atrocities became a daily occurrence. On August 3 a 21-year-old woman was shot dead by the Taliban for wearing tight-fitting clothes (i.e., not wearing a burka) and not being accompanied outside her home by a male relative. Gay men were to be executed by crushing them under falling walls. Also in accordance with Islamic teaching, in newly-captured towns, women, married as well as single, and girls, were abducted as what the *Koran* calls 'spoils of war' to be married to and then raped by Taliban fighters. All this and more...and from the left to the right, the West was silent, save for the comment on August 10 by President Biden, the Edith Piaf of the White House or if you prefer, Pontius Pilate, that he had no regrets for his decision to quit Afghanistan.

Others on the left would have had good cause for celebration. Back in 2001, in the wake of 9/11, the then back-bench Labour MP and professional anti-Zionist Jeremy Corbyn, together with the ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, Kamil Majid of the British Stalin Society, and the arch-Stalinist Andrew Murray, veteran leader of the Muscovite British Communist Party and Corbyn's chief strategist for the 2017 general election, jointly founded the Stop the War Coalition for the express purpose of opposing the removal of the misogynistic Taliban regime in Afghanistan by the armed forces of the USA. Twenty years on, and they had got what they wanted, the return of Afghan womanhood to an Islamic stone age.

Untroubled by the prospect of what a western withdrawal from Afghanistan would mean for its women, the selective feminists of the SWP's *Socialist Worker* were jubilant, saluting what it called 'a colossal defeat for British and US imperialism'...even though it would mean that 'life for women under the Taliban will indeed be repressive and harsh', 'a regime that tramples on rights'...an admission, if not in so many words, that that the government the Taliban had

overthrown was by comparison not 'repressive and harsh' for women. Under it, they could vote, pursue a career, study (50,000 at university in 2021) ... and play football. Why else the desperate attempts of women to escape Taliban rule? But when it came to the struggle against 'British and US imperialism', women's rights, especially in faraway Afghanistan, in the balance weighed nothing - as they did in the UK, when the SWP accused of racism those who exposed the organised gang-raping of under-age white girls by Muslim men. As always when these kinds of choices had to be made, there was always the bigger picture, even if the women of Afghanistan and the girls of Rotherham couldn't see it. In addition to Trump, Biden and the SWP, two more who did were Tory MP and chair of the House of Commons Defence [sic] Committee Toby Ellwood, who said that Afghanistan had been 'transformed' under Taliban rule (true, but he meant for the better), and Nottinghamshire County Council Deputy Lieutenant and Islamic scholar Dr Musharraf Hussein, who told the BBC that with the Taliban back in power, 'we have an amazing opportunity for Afghanistan after 40 years of war in the place', and for the Taliban 'to show they can bring a positive and really good change.' As for the thousands fleeing the Taliban, they were 'economic migrants', not genuine refugees. Presumably, this also applied to the babies passed to US servicemen over a fence at Kabul airport, leaving their mothers to face a return to a life of domestic and sexual servitude. All this, and not a whimper of protest or declaration of solidarity from their western sisters, or for that matter western leftists. Anyone familiar with critical race theory will know why. The Taliban patriarchy is not white.

(Corbyn in particular had something of a history when it came to the sexual abuse of women and girls by Muslim men. He sacked Rotherham MP Sarah Champion from his shadow front bench for speaking out against the Muslim rape industry in her own constituency and on another occasion, denied that Muslims were disproportionately involved in the trafficking, grooming and rape of underage girls, when the truth was that more than 90% of those convicted for these crimes were Muslim men, as compared to their 4% share of UK men as a whole. See chapter 27) A matter of days after the fall of Kabul, the final chapter in the betrayal that began with President Trump's withdrawal pledge to the Taliban in February 2020, thousands of exile Afghans took to the streets of central London to demonstrate their solidarity with their embattled compatriots. As one would expect, there was not a leftist placard or banner in sight. However, there was at least one which did condemn the West, though not for being in Afghanistan, but for leaving it in the lurch. A different kind of solidarity was on display on the same day the Coalition released its declaration of support for the Islamic State, when at the entrance to a London tube station, a 56-year-old man was forced to the ground and had his throat slashed in an attempted decapitation by an attacker who cried 'this is for Syria'. A by-stander, perhaps unaware of the *Koran's* injunction (Chapter 8, Verse 3) to 'smite those who disbelieve above the neck', or that the Islamic State's capital was located in Syria, called out, 'you ain't no Muslim bruv', a comment endorsed and promptly recycled by Prime Minister Cameron, like other politicians of all persuasions, always prepared to deny any connection between Islam and terrorism. The disclaimer was endorsed by a local Imam, with his totally false assertion that 'Islam does not allow and does not have any place for violent acts' (when did he last read his *Koran*?). As regards the religious identity of the 'bruv', all he had to say was that he was 'not a member of the congregation of Leytonstone and for his actions he can only answer for himself'.

Since it is a matter of no little importance in defining the nature and motivating forces of Jihadi terrorism, it might be helpful at this point to arrive at a definition of a Muslim that is agreed upon by respected Islamic authorities, and see to what degree, if any, it agrees with comments on the same subject by self-appointed but unqualified authorities such as the current Pope, Hilary Clinton, Barack Obama, Jeremy Corbyn, the current and previous Archbishops of Canterbury, Francois Hollande and David Cameron, to name but a few of many. According to one website that deals with such matters, *Islam Stack Exchange*, the *Koran* contains ‘no explicit definition of a Muslim’, though numerous verses specify actions and beliefs that are incumbent on Muslims to perform and hold, including, be it noted, *Jihad*, struggle, against the infidel. (See Appendix L) However, all such authorities concur that a Muslim, to again quote the same source, ‘is simply one that has accepted that “there is no God but Allah and [the] Prophet [i.e., Mohammed] is his messenger”’. A Muslim is expected to observe the ‘five pillars of Islam’, none of which is specified in the *Koran* but nevertheless are accepted as such by all but a handful of Muslims. They are: making the above declaration, praying five times a day to Mecca, giving alms, fasting during Ramadan, and making the pilgrimage to Mecca, the *Hajj*.

There are no provisions in Sharia law for the expulsion of Muslims from the faith for failing to observe any one of these requirements or, for that matter, for committing any action, however violent. In the case of *Hajj*, most Muslim men, for practical reasons, never make the pilgrimage to Mecca, while Muslim women can only make the journey if accompanied by a *mahram*, a male relative other than her husband. According to Sharia law, a Muslim can only become a non-Muslim by explicitly renouncing his or her faith, this being the crime of apostasy, for which there is only one penalty, death. A *hadith* of Sunan Abu Dawud is very clear on this point. One of ‘three things that are the root of faith’ is ‘not [n.b.] to declare him [i.e., a Muslim man] an unbeliever *whatever sins he commits*, and *not excommunicate him from Islam* for his any action.’ (Book 14, *Hadith* 2572, emphasis added). Yet that is exactly what Cameron, the self-appointed expert on Islamic theology, had done, unaware that a Muslim does not cease being a Muslim because of what he or she does, for example, by cutting someone’s throat at a London tube station, flying a passenger jet into a skyscraper, burning alive a fellow Muslim in a cage, or participating in the pimping or gang raping of a child, any more than a Roman Catholic ceases to be one for using a condom during sexual intercourse or willingly participating in the Nazi genocide of the Jews. A moment’s consideration will make it obvious why it is so difficult, if not impossible, to be excluded from a faith as a result of an action or thought that violates one or more of its laws. All three monotheisms are predicated on the belief that being imperfect, man is inherently sinful, for why else do we have gods that forgive as well as punish? According to the most recent edition of the catechism of the Roman Catholic Church, all mankind has inherited Adam’s Original Sin (disobeying god by seeking forbidden knowledge), ‘a sin with which we are all born afflicted, a sin which is the “death of a soul”’. First enunciated by St Paul, for all their differences on other issues, this doctrine is common to both Catholicism and all Protestant denominations. As Luther, something of a specialist when it came to sin, has it, ‘to be averse to goodness and prone to evil are traits in all men’. The teachings and practice of all three faiths necessarily take this into account when dealing with mankind’s inevitable lapses. In its never-ending battle against sin, heresy and

disbelief, the Roman Catholic Church has evolved over the centuries mechanisms, Ecclesiastical Courts, Cannon Law, and the non-Biblical ‘sacrament’ of penance (confession) for combatting, correcting and punishing those who stray from the path of the one true faith. By contrast, Islam has no comparable procedure for dealing with sinners. There is no confession, ex-communication, nor expulsion. Sin can only be forgiven by Allah: ‘And he it is Who accepts repentance from His servants and forgives sins. And He knows what you do.’ (*Koran*, 42: 26) The rule is, to which there are no exceptions: once a Muslim, always a Muslim, including ‘bruv’ who attempt to decapitate infidels.

There is another all-important difference today with not only the Roman church, but all Christian denominations and Judaism, one which for Muslims, is literally a matter of life and death. Whatever their holy books say, only Islam still claims and where and when it can, enforces, the right to kill those who defect from its ranks. When it comes to apostasy, unlike all other contemporary faiths, Islam is not only in theory, but also, where it is able to impose its laws, in practice a one-way street. Sharia law stipulates that adults of sound mind who freely choose to renounce Islam automatically incur the death penalty. One cannot escape from it by sinning. Indeed, throughout the *Koran*, interspersed between blood-curdling threats against his enemies, Allah gives reassurances that for all their backslidings, towards the faithful he is compassionate, merciful and forgiving. Chapter 66, Verse 9 is explicit: ‘O ye who believe! Turn to Allah in sincere repentance. It may be that your Lord will remit the evil effects of your deeds and admit you into Gardens through which streams flow...’ The website *Islam Stack Exchange* explains what happens, or rather does not happen, when Muslims depart from the straight and narrow. Whereas a Roman Catholic can be ex-communicated for performing specific actions or espousing certain beliefs (nine all told) the same does not hold for Muslims: ‘You may not be a perfect Muslim [and only Mohammed, we are told, was] but once you have accepted there is no God but God, then you are a Muslim...You may even make mistakes, in which case you will still be a Muslim, but a bad one’. Therefore, at the very worst, not, ‘you ain’t no Muslim, bruv’, but ‘you’re a bad Muslim, bruv’. And as we shall see, the bad Muslims are not the ones who ‘cut above the neck’ of an infidel, but those who are able but refuse to fight in the cause of Allah. (See Appendix L)

Western politicians who, by their comments on the topic, proclaim their abysmal ignorance of Islamic theology, and yet feel themselves qualified to make off-the-cuff judgments as to who is and is not Muslim, would doubtless take offence, even if only privately, if any Muslim in a similar state of ignorance were to decide who is or is not a Christian or a Jew. And there is another issue to consider. Given that following the tube station suspect’s arrest minutes later, the matter became *sub judice*, surely it would have been prudent to await the conclusion of the accused’s forthcoming trial on a charge of attempted murder before a Prime Minister of all people pronounced on what the suspect’s motives or his religion might be? Bruv or no bruv, at his trial in June 2016, it was established at the outset that Somali-born Muhiddin Mere was indeed a Muslim. On his mobile phone, images were found of Fusilier Lee Rigby, murdered and also nearly decapitated by two Muslim converts outside Woolwich Barracks, and the UK’s ‘Jihadi John’, who videoed himself, this time successfully, beheading a prisoner of the Islamic State, as per the *Koran*, Chapter 8, Verse 12. There were also on the same mobile phone searches for ‘Islam v West’ and two days before the Leytonstone attack, ‘Islamic State/ISIS’. ‘No

Muslim bruv'? Even the *Guardian* in its coverage of the trial described Mire as a 'practising Muslim'. So why 'no Muslim'? Why not, 'you ain't no Hindu bruv', or Sikh, Jew, Christian, or Buddhist? Strange, because whereas none of these faiths has followers who make it a regular habit to go around cutting people's heads off, the only one that does, as everyone by now must know, is...Islam. So could it be that the bystander's first reaction was that this was indeed yet another Muslim engaged in 'smiting above the neck' as per *Koran*, only for political correctness to kick in, thereby purging this correct 'thought crime' from his mind? Why say anything at all? Because everyone by now should know from media reports of videos depicting UK born and bred Islamic State executioners at work that only Muslims 'smite above the neck', and so the more that they do it, the greater is felt the need by the politically correct to pretend it isn't so.

A more typically Guardianista reaction to an act of terrorism followed the killing of a woman and the wounding of five others by another knife wielding Muslim of Somali parentage in Russell Square, central London, on August 3, 2016. Nowhere was there any reference to Islam. Instead, after speculating at length on the state of the attacker's mental health (as we have seen, a cause frequently invoked by those who wish to deny religious motives for terrorism), the article arrived at the conclusion that it is not so much the public that needs protection from Islamic terrorism, but the terrorists from themselves: 'About half the people feared to be at risk of [a strange formulation] terrorist sympathies may have mental health or psychological problems, a police study has found'. Trust the *Guardian* to be more concerned about the mental health of Muslim terrorists than the lives of their infidel victims. However, let us grant that what it says is true. But whatever the percentage, they all share with the remainder who are mentally normal a religion that requires them to kill those they regard as its enemies. That is not a mental health issue, but one of theology. And Zakaria Bulhan, the Russell Square assassin, like Mire, *was* a Muslim and, mental health problems or not, had been visiting websites featuring Islamic terrorism, in addition to a biography of Mohammed, Koranic verses and Islamic *hadith*. Those who are so ready to attribute such attacks solely to mental instability, as has frequently been the case with the BBC and security agencies, are surely obliged to explain why it is that Muslims allegedly afflicted with mental health disorders are infinitely more likely to attempt to cut off in public a complete stranger's head than atheists, agnostics and the followers of other faiths suffering from the same mental condition.

A similar incident to the London attempted decapitation, different only in that on this occasion, the head was successfully removed from its body, occurred in Moscow, on March 1, 2016, when a woman was seen (again, at the entrance to a Metro station) holding aloft the severed head of a four-year-old *kuffar* child she had been baby-minding. On this occasion, even the most politically correct Islamophile would have thought twice before crying out, 'you're no Muslim, sis', because the women proudly displaying her trophy was wearing a full-length hijab. And on her arrest, she laid all doubts to rest as to her religious affiliations when she smilingly explained that the child's decapitation had been 'ordered by Allah'. In a video of her police interview, she can be seen and heard saying that she read the *Koran* day and night. Some four weeks later, a Koranic decapitation also featured in the trial and conviction on terrorist charges of two UK Muslims, Junead Khan, from that hotbed of Jihadism, Luton, and his uncle, Shazib. Together with his uncle, Junead had planned to emulate the murder of Fusillier Lee Rigby by two Muslim men

outside Woolwich Barracks by beheading a US serviceman, likewise chosen at random, outside the RAF base at Mildenhall in Suffolk. Both were also found guilty of attempting to travel to Syria to join the Islamic State. Junead evidently idolised the UK born and bred Islamic State executioner known as ‘Jihadi John’, because he planned to purchase a knife identical to that used by Jihadi John in his videoed decapitations. When police searched his home, they found an Islamic State flag, which he had intended to unfurl at the scene of the decapitation. On his arrest, he shouted ‘*Allahu Akbar*’, ‘God is great’. Another case of ‘you ain’t no Muslim bruv’? Yet once these non-Muslims find themselves serving prison sentences for terrorist offences, not only does the prison system classify them as Muslims when they declare themselves as such, but they are also regarded and treated as Muslims by their prison Chaplains and by the provision of *Halal* food.

No less perverse is the practice of describing Muslims who commit other atrocious crimes, for example the convicted pimping and rape gangs of Rotherham, Oxford, Rochdale, Sheffield, Aylesbury, Halifax, Keighley, and a score or more other locations, by their ethnic, usually Pakistani ‘heritage’, yet defining Muslims who are not the perpetrators but the victims of crimes by their religion. This practice of using different labels depending on whether Muslims are the good or the bad guys is obviously inspired by political correctness, the intention being to avoid saying bad things about certain Muslims. It is a choice that tells us much about our current political climate, in which it is better to be accused of anti-Pakistani racism rather than Islamophobia. (See Chapter 17) This policy was evident in the tragic case of Asad Shah, the Glasgow shopkeeper murdered in March 2016. The police described his killing as ‘racially motivated’, while the *Independent*, like the media generally, had no hesitation in describing the victim as a ‘Muslim shopkeeper’. Some may well have asked themselves, did we have here not only racially motivated murder, but also one driven by ‘Islamophobia’ as a reaction to the Brussels massacres only two days earlier? In fact, it was neither. Glasgow police announced three days after the murder that they had arrested a 32-year-old Muslim man in connection with not a ‘racial’ or ‘Islamophobic’ murder, but a ‘*religiously prejudiced*’ crime. The victim, it transpired, was a member of the much-despised and in Muslim countries, vilely persecuted Amadiyyah sect, whose motto is, ‘love for all, hatred for none,’ ideals obviously not shared by his killer, Tanveer Ahmed from Bradford, who through his lawyer, explained that Asad Shad had ‘disrespected the Prophet of Islam’ and that, ‘if I had not done this, then others would’. We can believe him, because on August 9, 2016, after receiving a life sentence for what the judge called a ‘barbaric, premeditated and wholly unjustified killing’, Ahmed turned to his supporters in court, some 40 strong, raised his fist and shouted, ‘praise for the Prophet Mohammed, there is only one prophet’, to which they responded in kind.

So here we had not a racially or ‘Islamophobically’ motivated murder of a Muslim by an infidel, but a case of one Muslim murdering another, not because of mental health issues, or greed, jealousy or any other conventional criminal motive, but again, over *theology*, one of several instances of Muslims transplanting onto UK streets lethal feuds that originated in another century and another continent. Nothing daunted, even after the religious nature of the crime was established, the indefatigably politically correct BBC continued to describe the murder as ‘racially motivated’ despite both the killer and his victim being of the same Pakistani origin. And where, one might ask, were the voices of protest by

British Muslims against this crime conducted in the name of their faith? There was not only silence, but worse. Without exception, the UK's Muslim organisations demonstrated exactly what they thought of the court's verdict by boycotting the inter-faith service held in remembrance of Asad Shah, a victim of his own religion's lethal intolerance.

All the evidence that is available points to three inescapable conclusions: firstly, that nearly all terrorist acts crimes today are being committed by those who describe themselves as Muslims; secondly, they claim that their actions are in the name of and sanctioned by their faith and, thirdly, that only amongst those describing themselves as Muslims are to be found sizable percentages who believe, to one degree or another, that such actions are or can be justified, again by their faith. Yet, after more than two decades in which hundreds of such terrorist acts have been perpetrated by those who describe themselves as Muslims, there are still those who simply cannot admit, at least publicly, the truth of these three propositions.

In May 2016, Manchester police conducted an anti-terrorist exercise in the Trafford Centre. At midnight, a man dressed in black entered The Orient food court and, to add a touch of extra realism to the proceedings, cried out '*Allahu Akbar*' moments before a controlled explosion simulated a suicide bombing. A scene just like this, only for real, has been played out hundreds of times across the globe, with tragic results that we all know only too well. That is why Trafford Centre had not been chosen randomly for this exercise. Just a few minutes away, at the city's Arndale Centre, in April 2009, when the Centre's concourse would have been packed with Easter shoppers, Al-Qaeda was hours away from staging a horrendous massacre when an intercepted phone call led to the arrest of twelve suspected terrorists. The plan was to explode a massive car bomb at the entrance to the Centre and then, as the panic-stricken survivors poured out into St Ann's Square, slaughter them by a team of suicide bombers, in all probability crying '*Allahu Akbar*' as they pressed the button. So, we can easily understand why Manchester's Trafford Centre been chosen for this exercise. However, within hours of its completion, the PC brigade had pounced. Manchester 'Peace Activist' Erinma Bell objected to the depiction of the terrorist as a Muslim, claiming 'a terrorist could be anyone', (presumably then including herself) and insisting that 'we need to move away from stereotypes', which as we know, leads on to the even more reprehensible 'profiling', in which security agencies with finite resources focus on those categories statistically the most likely to commit terrorist offences, in the first-place young Muslim men instead of for example Quaker grandmothers. The next time such an exercise is conducted, perhaps Bell would prefer to hear called out, in no particular order, the praises of Zeus, Jesus, Buddha, Jehovah, Krishna, Allah, Thor, Apollo, Zoroaster, Mani, Wotan, Isis and so on until all the world's more than 3,000 deities, seers and prophets past and present have been made to share equal responsibility for a crime which the police, mistakenly according to Bell, only identifies with one of them.

One wonders what Bell's private thoughts were when a year later in the same city, Salman Ramadan (sic) Abedi, a real and not imitation Muslim, killed 23 and wounded 119 concert goers, many being children, in a suicide bomb attack in the foyer of the Manchester Arena as the audience was leaving a gig by the US singer Ariana Grande, or when one of the three Muslim assassins in the London Bridge attack of June 4 cried out, as he stabbed his victim to death 'this is for Allah'. Bell's political correctness was both comical and harmless. However, the Manchester

Arena atrocity tragically confirmed that there are certain situations when it can be lethal. At the inquest on its victims, a security steward on duty at the arena admitted he had ample cause to suspect the bomber was up to no good, but because he was Asian, decided to take no action for fear of being accused of racism. Here was a man with a huge pack on his back, far too young to be the father of a typical early teens child attending the gig, lurking in dark corners and muttering to himself as if praying (which he was) - obviously someone who had no legitimate reason to be where he was. The steward admitted as much, saying that the bomber, Abedi, gave him a 'bad feeling', being 'fidgety and sweating'. But he was 'scared of being wrong and branded a racist'. (Yet again) If he 'got it wrong', he 'would have got into trouble'. 'I wanted to get it right and not mess it up by over-reacting or judging someone by their race.' Why did he not then judge him, not by his race, but by his behavior, his huge back pack, his muttering, his sweating, his fidgeting, his age? Because, as is now the way, a spurious anti- (and in this instance, also lethal) racism outweighed all the indicators that his six months of training should have led to his taking immediate action. But instead, to 'get it right', 'not to mess it up', to keep his job at possibly the cost of untold children's lives, to prove he was not a racist, he suppressed his well-founded suspicions.

Here we have again, with truly horrendous consequences (23 dead, 119 wounded), the same fear that facilitated for decades the unhindered operation by Muslim men of the UK's child rape industry. (See Chapter 27) Another security (sic) steward had also suspected Abedi's motives. As an Asian Muslim himself, he had no reason to share his colleague's fear of accusations of racism. And unlike his more inexperienced colleague, he should have spotted Abedi a mile off, because this was the 30th event he had stewarded. He too had noticed the same furtive behavior, the huge back-pack. He too admitted that it had 'crossed his mind' (sic) that Abed was a suicide bomber. Yet when he was approached by a concerned member of the public, he gave him the brush off. 15 minutes later, Allah was avenged, for what, only the then Labour Leader knew. His response to the Manchester atrocity was the same as his to 7/7, to place at least part of the blame on British foreign policy, saying 'we need to change what we do abroad', without specifying what changes he had in mind. In effect, Corbyn was demanding that the followers of one, and only one, particular religion should exercise a veto over UK foreign policy, and that if they were not allowed to do so, any violence that ensued would be at the very least, partly the fault of the British government. (As we shall see in due course, Jewish 'lobbies' and 'cabals' on the other hand are routinely accused of doing just this on Corbynista websites, only in their case with nefarious intentions.)

If Jihadi atrocities are indeed retribution for western foreign policies, precisely what was being avenged when on August 18, 2017, in the Finland city of Turku, a Moroccan asylum seeker stabbed two women to death and wounded eight other victims, six of them women? The crimes of Finland's imperialism? Their membership of NATO? Since he shared many intimacies with Islamic terrorists, Comrade Corbyn should have enlightened the relevant authorities as to the assassin's true motives so they could make the desired adjustments. Yet he was not the only party leader prepared to submit to Islam's veto on UK policies. Tory Prime Minister Theresa May, after granting illegal entry into the UK for Muslim men aged 30 or more posing as children half their age, denied asylum to fellow Christian Asa Bibi, held in solitary confinement by Pakistan for eight years after

being sentenced to death on a trumped-up charge of blaspheming Islam, on the grounds that it might provoke Muslim riots in the UK and attacks on British embassies abroad. We cannot exclude the possibility that similar considerations led to the failure to prosecute Muslim perpetrators of female genital mutilation, 'honour killings', bigamous, forced and child marriages and gang rape. Anything for a quiet life. So thought Chamberlain. Yet anyone familiar with the *Koran's* teachings on *Jihad* will know that as was the case with Hitler, whatever the West does will never be enough to appease an ideology that demands total submission, in Arabic, *Islam*, to the will and rule of Allah.

For his part, Corbyn clearly believed that Islamic terrorism - only of course like all establishment politicians, he never used this accurate term - had nothing to do with the religion of those who carry it out but is driven by legitimate resentments against 'the West', ones which we were morally obliged to redress. If that is indeed the case, then he surely needed to account for the fact that since 9/11, at least 75% of the global total of terrorist atrocities had been when both the victims and the perpetrators were Muslims who belonged to different schools of the same faith, as in the slaughter by Islamic State gunmen of more than 300 Egyptian Sufis at prayer on November 24, 2017. Given his explanation for the *rationale* driving Islamic terrorism, it was incumbent on Corbyn to demonstrate what murdering Egyptian Sufis had to do with either British or western foreign policy. For someone who had spent much of his adult life moving in Islamic circles, and had therefore more opportunity than most infidels to become acquainted with the religion's history, he should surely have known that 'the West' was in no way responsible for its internecine bloodlettings, since they originated in the feuds that erupted in the years immediately following the death of the faith's founder in 632

Even with terrorist attacks in the West, is hard, if not impossible, to see in them any attempt to change its foreign policy, and even harder, if such is indeed the case, what those changes might be, not least because those that carry the attacks out or the organisations that claim responsibility for them almost invariably advertise their exclusively religious motivation. On the very same day, May 10, of the Manchester anti-terrorist exercise that so distressed Bell, at the train station in the Bavarian town of Grafting, a very stereotypical knife-wielding man, to the cry of, yes, '*Allahu Akbar*' and, in German, 'you are infidels, you must die', stabbed to death one victim and seriously wounded three others. The next day, in Baghdad's Shi'a quarter, explosions killed 63 Muslims and wounded many more, while further north, suicide bombers killed another 29, followed by another massacre of 16 Shi'ites in the town of Balad on May 13. Both the killings in Germany and Iraq were clearly purely religious in motivation. The same can be said of the Orlando gay night club massacre of June 12, with its 49 dead and 53 wounded, while all we know about the Bastille Day slaughter in France, when a Tunisian driving a truck mowed down 84 men, women and children and wounded 303 more on a Nice promenade, is that the driver was a Muslim.

Four days later, on July 18, German train passengers were again the target when another of Chancellor's Merkel's illegal guests, a self-proclaimed 'soldier of the Caliphate', Riaz Khan Ahmadzai, a bogus asylum seeker from Pakistan (sic), to the stereotypical cry of '*Allahu Akbar*,' launched an axe attack in a train travelling near Würzburg, wounding 18 before being shot dead by police. At his refugee lodgings, police later found a home-made Islamic State flag. Acquaintances described him as 'calm' and 'quiet'. But again, in the unlikely event that he knew or cared what it

was, we are told nothing about his opinions of Germany foreign policy. Predictably, a Green Party Bundestag deputy expressed sympathy not only for the victims, but also for their attacker, asking, 'couldn't they have shot to disable him?' One can imagine the scene. A police marksman, having established the nationality of the terrorist, calls out in Urdu: 'Would you please be so good as to stop what you doing for a moment, put down that blood-stained axe you are wielding, and stand still, so we can shoot you in the leg?' Perhaps this is the kind of police tactics Corbyn intended to adopt if had become Prime Minister, as an alternative to the current 'shoot to kill' policy which, as an advocate of a 'kinder politics' he so abhors - except when practised by his Jihadi 'friends'.

Only days later again, a Munich shopping centre was the target of an attack that left nine dead and 21 wounded. The lone assassin, Iranian by origin, was described by a neighbour as 'a good human being'. The next day, in Kabul, a suicide bomber attacked a demonstration by the Shi'ite Hazara ethnic minority, killing 80 and wounded another 231. Then the day after that, in Reutlingen, South West Germany, a Syrian failed asylum seeker hacked to death a pregnant woman with a machete and wounded a man and a woman before being seized by police, while later the same day, in Ansbach, Bavaria, a Syrian suicide bomber, denied entry to a rock concert, blew himself up outside a wine bar instead, killing himself and wounding 15. Police initially claimed the casualties were caused by a gas explosion. Two days later, on July 26, *Jihad* switched to France, Somalia and Syria. In Normandy, two assassins, to the cry of '*Allahu Akbar*', burst into a Catholic Church during a service and then videoed themselves as they forced to his knees and cut the throat of an 84-year-old priest. *Pace* Corbyn, both Muslims were then shot dead by police. The mother of one of the two assassins, Abdel Malik Petitjean, having identified her son from a police photo, then claimed 'he's not implicated in any of this'. He was 'a good Frenchman. He's soft'. Soft or not, he still tried to cut off the head of an 84-year-old clergyman. The same day, in Mogadishu, Somalia, 13 people were killed by suicide bomb explosions near the capital's air terminal. The following day, rounding off this orgy of bloodletting, a suicide bomber massacred 52 and wounded 170 in the Kurdish town of Qamishli in north Syria. In each of these attacks, fourteen in total, conducted on four continents and with a death toll of 398, the perpetrators were not Erinna Bell's random 'anyone.' They all conformed to the entirely predictable if much decried stereotype of being Muslims. And in not one their attacks was there, again *pace* Corbyn, the least indication that the motive or target was the foreign policy of any Western government. In Europe alone, in the period between January 1, 2015, and the end of July, 2016, the number of civilians killed in terror attacks by Muslims was 439, a rate approaching five a week.

In the midst of this global Muslim mayhem and murder, back in the UK, we had the life sentence passed on Junead Khan, the Luton (*quelle surprise*) delivery driver, for plotting to kill military personnel outside a US air base, a plan inspired by the murder of Fusillier Lee Rigby outside Woolwich Barracks in May 2013. Two actual attempts to carry out just such an assassination then followed, the first on July 21, 2016, when two men, described as 'of Middle Eastern appearance' narrowly failed to drag into a car at knife point a serviceman outside an air base in Norfolk, and the second on August 3 outside the Aldershot Garrison, again by two men of the same profile. Regarding Kahn, police found on his mobile phone images of him posing with an Islamic State-style black flag, later found in his attic. He was also convicted, along with his uncle, Shazib Khan, of planning to travel to Syria to

fight for the Islamic State. In passing sentence, the trial judge eschewed the usual niceties in spelling out what, on the basis of the evidence presented, were the two Khans' theological, again, *pace* Corbyn, not political, motives for their actions: 'They both believe that Sharia law is the only legitimate law, and both reject democracy, because it involves law being made by people and not by God'. For once, exactly right. And this is what all Muslims are supposed to believe, though most, thankfully do not act on it. Even so, with the exceptions of the massacres carried out by a far rightist in Norway in 2011 and Christchurch in 2019, (the latter blamed by the local imam on Mossad), and if we exclude the hundreds of entirely non-political and non-religious US 'mass shootings', the rest of the atrocities since 9/11 have been the work of Muslims... London's 7/7, the Madrid station bombings and the Beslan school massacre of 2004, the killings in Boston, St. Bernardino, Paris, Toulouse, Copenhagen, Brussels, Marseilles, Nairobi, Garissa, Tunisia, Jerusalem, Baghdad, Nice, Berlin, Manchester, Westminster, Kabul, Colombo, Bombay... There is a very simple question that needs to be answered by those who insist that these and other similar atrocities have 'nothing to do with Islam.' If so, would they have occurred if Islam did not exist?

The insistence by politicians and Christian clerics that Islam as a (or even 'the') religion of peace is, as a matter of course and necessity, extended to presenting the whole gamut of Sharia law in a favourable light. In announcing a long overdue government inquiry into Sharia courts in the UK, the then Tory Home Secretary and from July 2016, devoutly Christian Prime Minister Theresa May hastened to add that the investigation should not be understood as being in any way critical of Sharia law as such, but rather its 'misuse'. On the contrary, Sharia law, like other religion-based legal codes, 'benefit[s] a great deal' those that are subject to its provisions. Home Office Minister Lord Ahmed of Wimbledon, more fully appraised than May of exactly what Sharia law entails so far as Muslim women are concerned, made it clear that the inquiry 'will not be a review of the totality of Sharia law, which is a source of guidance [sic] for many Muslims in the UK.' Secularist campaigner Baroness Cox took issue with May's claim that Sharia law was being 'misused'. It had 'aspects which are causing concerns, such as that a man can divorce his wife by saying three times "I divorce you". That is inherent [in Sharia law]; the right [of a husband] to chastise a woman [[i.e., his wife, and rape her] is inherent [See Chapter 3 and Appendix O]; polygamy is inherent. I don't think these things are distortions of Sharia law. These are aspects of Sharia law which are unacceptable.' Like, for example, female genital mutilation, child, forced and bigamous marriage. But not, apparently, to Prime Minister-to-be Theresa May and Lord Ahmed.

Fortunately, when it comes to establishing the motives for religiously-inspired crimes, testimony, logic and evidence of necessity still prevail in our courts of law when Muslims accused of terrorism are on trial, as was the case in the trial of the two Khans. There, due process requires that crucial questions of motive are not so easily swept under the carpet or invented after the manner of our politicians, media and Sharia leftists. When, in December 2015, the young Muslim couple, Mohammed Rehman and his wife Sana Ahmed, were both given life sentences after being found guilty of preparing a suicide bomb attack in London, the presiding Judge, Justice Jeremy Baker, said the would-be assassins 'by the early summer of 2014...appeared to be showing interest in matters related to Islam' and had consequently become 'radicalised Islamists, [the standard euphemism for devout Muslims who respond to Islam's call to *Jihad*] committed to the ideology of the

Islamic State.’ Addressing Rehman, who had underlined Jihadist passages in the *Koran* and boasted on Twitter he was ‘preparing for a martyrdom operation’, Judge Baker said he was ‘satisfied that it was you who became interested in the theological [n.b.] justification of its [the planned massacre’s] aims’, a conclusion somewhat at odds with Hilary Clinton’s assurance that there is no connection ‘whatsoever’ between terrorism and Muslims.

Rehman’s partner in terror, Sana Ahmed, as is nearly always the case in such trials, in no sense conformed to the profile of the ‘marginalised’ Muslim underdog. Sana was an English graduate and her mother a JP who, having been a Senior Manager in Reading Borough Council Youth and Community Service, moved on to become a departmental manager at the Reading company Solutions 4 Health. The Khan family owned two Mercedes, and a Toyota for their daughter’s use. Khan junior worked at her mother’s firm, and part-time at a local junior school, the two incomes helping to fund the explosives intended for the planned massacre. And of course, friends found her ‘gentle and mild mannered’, ‘someone who related well with adults and particularly with children’...but not, so it would appear, the children as well as adults whom she intended to kill for the sake of Allah. Another friend described her as a ‘thoroughly decent young woman’, yet one who had, like her husband, been busy underlining the passages in the *Koran* that transformed her, like so many other young Muslims, into someone who plotted the random murder of total strangers. One of the Koranic passages read out in court as evidence for her motive commanded: ‘Warfare is ordained for you though it is hateful for you. It may happen that you hate a thing that is good for you and that you love a thing that is bad for you’. (Chapter 2, Verse 216) Even Rehman, a low life junkie, once messaged his wife, who funded his ‘habit’, to tell her that ‘God is really the only one who is there for me’, while the Islamic State, he told police after his arrest, was ‘quite cool’. And none of this had anything to do with Islam? And if it hadn’t, what had it to do with? Poverty? ‘Exclusion’? But not one Muslim on trial for terrorism has made this claim, either on his or her own behalf, or that of their fellow Muslims. Only gullible western Islamophiles do that.

The conviction and sentencing of home-grown terrorist plotters Rehman and Khan were followed a matter of days later by the release by the Islamic State of a promotional video depicting the execution of five alleged spies. The masked executioner was identified, like ‘Jihadi John’, by his voice, as being of UK origin. Experts concluded that the voice was that of Siddhartha Dhar from the east London borough of Walthamstow aka Walthamstan, a Hindu convert to Islam under the name of Abu Rumasayah. How did they know? It transpired that Dhar was an associate of the benefits parasite and Muslim preacher Anjem Choudary and had been arrested with him in September 2014 on terrorist charges. Unlike Choudary, Dhar was granted police bail. A matter of hours later, he was on his way with his family to Syria to join to the Islamic State. Once there, he made the video, boasting of his new allegiance, with a voice that experts matched with the executioner’s. He also posted a ‘selfie’ posing with an AK assault rifle in one hand and his baby on the other. Another Brit featured in the video was identified as that of Jihadi bride convert Grace Dare from south London. Back in the UK, Dhar’s mother admitted that the executioner’s voice was almost certainly that of her son. Hard though it was for her, a Hindu, to accept that he was now probably serving as an executioner for the Islamic State, even if this was true, she still believed he was ‘a pleasant boy’. Maternal love for an errant son one can understand. But why did Corbyn refuse to

offer a comment on the video when asked to do so? Another trial of ‘home grown’ Muslim zealots began at the Old Bailey on January 18, 2016. Again, the backgrounds of the accused were all too familiar. Two of the four young men accused of plotting to murder either a policeman or a soldier were recent converts to Islam, while the remaining two were both medical students, training, partly at British tax payers’ expense, for occupations that are dedicated to preserving life, not destroying it. They were not the first Muslim medics to embark on the path of terrorism. On June 29, 2007, two car bombs were detected and rendered harmless in London’s West End. Both vehicles contained petrol cans, propane gas canisters and nails, and a mobile phone-connected trigger. The next day, a Cherokee jeep loaded with propane gas canisters was driven at high speed through the glass entrance doors of Glasgow airport terminal and set ablaze. The driver of the vehicle was severely burned, while five members of the public were injured by the resulting explosion. The two occupants in the jeep were arrested by police. Both were Muslims. The passenger, a British-born Wahhabi, Bilal Abdullah, was of Iraqi descent...and a doctor. The driver, Indian-born Kafeel Ahmed, a follower of Osama bin Laden, was an engineer. He later died of his injuries. Police investigations rapidly established that the two Muslims involved in the Glasgow incident were also responsible for the abortive car bomb attack in London. Had the two attacks achieved their intended objectives, scores, possibly hundreds, would have been killed and wounded. Of the five Muslim men subsequently arrested in the UK in connection with the attacks, two were also doctors working in British hospitals, while yet another doctor, Mohamed Haneef, was arrested in Queensland Australia on related charges. Abdullah received a life prison sentence, while charges against the other four doctors were either dropped or not proved. Be that as it may, one doctor turned mass assassin was one too many.

There was much bewilderment, both in the press and among his relatives, when in May 2016, the story broke that another Muslim doctor, 37-year-old Issam Abuanza had two years previously left his wife and two children to become a Jihadi warrior for ISIS. His new duties were graphically portrayed in a number of ‘selfies’, one of which showed the former doctor-turned killer in full combat kit, proudly brandishing not a stethoscope but a Kalashnikov submachine gun. His sister told the BBC that ‘he used to be quite the dashing young man, very modern. I’ve no idea how he became like this or who showed him the path to terror.’ No idea? I have. Let us begin with the fact that he had as a role model Ayman al-Zawahiri, first a surgeon and medical professor at Cairo University and then the late Osama bin-Laden’s successor as leader of al-Qaeda. Then, if Hilary Clinton will permit, as a highly educated male Muslim of combat age, we can be reasonably sure that Abuanza was familiar with those numerous passages in the *Koran*, (which will be cited in due course – see Appendix L) that call upon the faithful to do battle in the cause of Allah, a summons which he evidently believed, like Ayman al-Zawahiri, overrode his obligation as a doctor to save life, not take it. How else can we explain his message, posted the day after the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre, ‘God bless this act of terrorism’? Or another posting, denouncing the USA as ‘Godless’? If only. And yet another, celebrating the videoed burning alive of a captured Jordanian fighter pilot; ‘I would’ve liked for them to burn him extremely slowly and I could treat him so we [sic] could torch him once more.’ This, from a *doctor*? The Koranic inspiration for these sentiments is to be found in the *Koran*, Chapter 4, Verse 57: ‘Those who disbelieve in Our Signs, We shall cause them to enter Fire. As often as

their skins are burnt up, We give them in exchange other skins that they may continue to taste the punishment. Surely, Allah is mighty and Wise', and Chapter 76, Verse 4: 'We have prepared for the disbeliever's chains and iron collars and blazing fire'.

Yes, take away his religion, and his actions will indeed defy any rational explanation, other than that he might be clinically insane or a psychopath. But he was neither. The history of religion is replete with examples of profound devotion making people do things that to the rationally minded, exhibit all the hallmarks of insanity, pathological cruelty or at the very least, mental instability of one sort or another. We have the much-emulated example of Simeon Stylites (from which stiletto), the fifth century monk who lived for 37 years on top of a pole, while the mostly female Anchorites of the early Christian church chose to be bricked up for life in a space 12 to fifteen feet square. Self-flagellation was all the rage in the 16th century, and is still with us today amongst the Catholic elite of Opus Dei, who strap spikes to their upper thighs. At the other end of the social scale there are the Appalachian snake dancers, following to the letter, and sometimes to an early grave, the injunction of Mark 16: 17-18 to 'take up serpents'. Whatever we may think of their extraordinary behaviour, in each instance, the choice and the consequences had been theirs alone. But not so in the case of Herbert and Catherine Schiabe, the devout Christian parents convicted in 2013 of second-degree murder by a Philadelphia court. Rather than send for a doctor when their child fell ill, they opted instead for the power of prayer. Hours later, their child, whom we can sure they loved, was dead. But they loved their god more. On average, ten children a year die in the USA in similar circumstances. Now let us look again at Dr. Abuanza's transformation from a healer into a sadistic killer. It is easy enough to accept that a doctor, like any other husband, could desert his wife and children for another woman, perhaps a patient. But not to become an assassin for a terrorist theocracy, revelling in and glorifying the most extreme acts of cruelty imaginable. Something extra is required for that, and his religion provided it. The only remotely comparable precedent for Abuanza's betrayal of his Hippocratic Oath are the 'experiments' perpetrated by Nazi doctors on Jews in the death camps of the Third Reich, two of whom found employment after the war in Muslim Egypt. (See Chapter 6) Here we have another Muslim medic, as featured on the Canary Mission website, which, as we shall see again in this work, exposes the activities and statements of anti-Semites: 'Riad Abboud, a pre-med student, says his "life-long dream" is to work as an "emergency doctor". Yet, about "Zionists" he says, "show no mercy". He hopes that "all Zionists suffer until their last breath, and then suffer in the after-life."'.

Two of the most illuminating cases that came to court in 2016 both involved converts, as is so often the way with the religion of peace, doing their utmost to prove their zeal by killing for their newly embraced faith. The first was that of the parents of so-called 'Jihadi Jack'. Jack Letts, then, as a convert to Islam, aka Abu Mohammed, left his comfortable Oxford home in 2014 when 18 to join the Islamic State in Iraq. Though he called himself a 'front line fighter', his parents refused to accept that he had taken up arms for the Islamic State, and launched a petition protesting their son's innocence. (In May 2017, he was captured by Kurdish forces in northern Syria, and then charged in October by the UK with fighting for the Islamic State.) Despite their denials, his parents were both convicted in June 2019 of sending assets to their son that they knew were to be used for the furtherance of

terrorism. ‘Jihadi Jack’, who could be seen smiling in a ‘selfie’ giving the Islamic State salute (the index finger pointed up to paradise) and sporting a well-developed regulation Islamic beard, was described by friends as a ‘typical middle-class kid’.

The second case was that of former UK soldier Gavin Rae, aka Yakub Rae, sentenced to 18 years for firearms offences and attempting to travel to Syria with his two youngest children to fight for the Islamic State. Comments made after his conversion included: ‘It’s not going to be long now before Islam comes to the shores of this country, and if they reject it, we’ll fight them, because this is what Allah wants’, and Britain was ‘horrible’ and its women ‘filthy’. Despite Rae’s conviction for trying to illegally obtain an Uzi submachine gun and a Baikal handgun and silencer, together with several boxes of ammunition for each weapon, and a previous conviction for armed robbery, there was the usual *pro forma* denial by a close relative of any violent intent. His sister, Lindsey, claimed ‘he wouldn’t heart a fly, he’s too soft’. That is, until he converted to Islam. In the light of cases such as these, it is difficult to see how Cameron’s plan to combat ‘extremism’ by encouraging prosperous, well-educated converted and hereditary Muslims to buy their own homes, or Muslim mothers to learn English, desirable though this latter aim is, would have had any impact whatsoever on the UK’s home-grown Muslim terrorism, because, as the *Koran* clearly states time and again, *Jihad* is not waged for material gain in this world, but for Allah and the reward of the pleasures of the next. (See Chapter 11)

The message of the four suicide bombers who carried out the London transport massacre of July 7, 2005 could not have made this any clearer: ‘Our drive and motivation does not come from tangible commodities that the world has to offer. Our religion is Islam, obedience to the one true God and following in the footsteps of the final prophet messenger.’ They were, like most of the UK Muslims who have engaged in terrorism, described by those who knew them, as ‘ordinary’, ‘normal’. Yet two had left behind a wife, one pregnant, and a child. Another, Hasib Hussein, described by his former school teachers as a ‘slow, gentle giant’, played for his local football and cricket teams and had just completed a course in business studies at a college in Leeds. But his sole ambition was to kill as many infidels as possible. They were the harbingers of what would ten years later, with the proclamation of the Islamic State Caliphate, be hundreds of similar young British Muslims who, like the 7/7 bombers, were only too willing to sacrifice the material benefits that come with higher education, a professional career and the comforts of a secure home and family life to become warriors or Jihadi brides for Allah and, by dying for the cause, earn their passage to paradise. All Cameron had to offer were mortgages and English lessons.

It is said that we in the west inhabit an increasingly secular world. And that in many ways is true. But at the very summits of this secular world, deference to ancient superstitions is still the order of the day. ‘Respect’ must be paid not only to religious freedom, which of course it should be and is, unlike in the world of Islam, but also as a matter of course and good public form, to the claims that religions make about themselves and the workings of the natural world. In the case of Islam where, for a number of obvious reasons, politicians tread the most carefully of all, the creation of the founding text of Islam is held by its faithful to be not merely inspired by god, as with the Bible, but actually dictated word for word by Allah via his intermediary Gabril (Gabriel) to his final prophet, Mohammed. Unlike Christians, Muslims of whatever school, however ‘reformist’, are not only

supposed to believe that every single word of their holy book, being the word of god, is literally true. Surveys have shown that in nearly every case, *they actually do*. And therein lies the problem.

So no-one should expect any Islamic cleric who values not only his living but his very life to voice the smallest doubt concerning the authenticity of Allah's promise of the carnal delights that await the martyred Jihadi, for they are inscribed on the pages of the *Koran* itself. Those whom it defines as 'the foremost', 'near to God' will be 'seated on couches inwrought with gold and jewels, reclining thereon, facing each other. There will wait on them, youths who will not age, carrying goblets and ewers and cups filled out of a flowing spring. No headache will they get therefrom, nor will they be intoxicated [Allah's alcohol-free wine maybe?] and carrying such fruits as they chose. And flesh of birds they desire. And there will be fair maidens with wide, lovely eyes, like pearls preserved as a reward for what they did.' (Chapter 56, Verses 11-25) And so those aspiring to Allah's bounty will continue to volunteer for martyrdom, programmed from early childhood to believe that 'the life of this world is only sport and a pastime, a temporary provision' while 'the hereafter is certainly the permanent abode', a place of infinite delights, a 'garden the value whereof is equal to the value of the heaven and the earth'. (*Koran*, 57: 22 and 40: 40)

Let us look at some more of Allah's Jihadi recruits who have been beguiled by such fantasies. Still only in January 2016, the trial of 26-year health worker Tareena Shakil ended with her conviction for becoming one of around sixty Muslim women who left the UK to serve the Islamic State, most as 'Jihadi brides'. Using a student loan to pay for her fare, she secretly decamped with her toddler son to Syria in October 2014, where she married a Jihadi, posted messages calling on Muslims to 'take up arms' and proclaiming her intention of becoming a martyr. She also posted a surrealist photo of herself in a burka brandishing a Kalashnikov machine gun, and another of her son wearing a balaclava with an IS logo next to an automatic weapon. Her explanation was that her son 'loved hats'. And AK 47 machine guns? In her defence, it was claimed she had joined the Islamic State not to fight (then why the gun and messages?) but purely to live under Sharia law. But why choose the Islamic State when there were several other Islamic states offering the same facility to devout Muslim women, including flogging, beheading, wife-beating, marital rape and stoning to death?

Come February, and the judicial assembly line had rolled on, busily delivering and processing yet more batches of actual and aspiring Jihadis. Converts were once again to the fore, eager to prove their commitment to the Religion of Assassins. Swansea University student Edward Thomas appeared in court to plead guilty to taking a replica hand gun into the university's library. He told police that he had converted to Islam in June of the previous year, but claimed he was no longer religious. So why the gun? In the same week, the trial began at the Old Bailey of Tarik Hassane, who pleaded guilty to charges of conspiracy to murder and preparation of terrorist acts. Three other Muslims charged with him for the same offences pleaded not guilty. One of the three, Nathan Cuffy, to judge by his name, was a convert. In a separate case, also conducted at the Old Bailey, Naseer Taj was found guilty of terrorist offences. He had been apprehended as he finalised plans to abandon his pregnant wife and head to Syria to begin a new life as a Jihadi, complete with a replacement wife supplied by the Islamic State. As the tally of arrests mounted, so more cases accumulated in the pipe line. Was there any ground

for doubting that all those charged would prove to be Muslims? As if this was not enough, the ancient feuds that were tearing apart the religion of peace in its own domain inevitably spilt over into the ever-growing Muslim diaspora. In September 2015, two teenagers were arrested following an arson attack on the Baitul Futuh mosque in South London. The mosque, with a capacity of 10,000, belonged to the Amadiyyah sect, which is not recognised as truly Islamic by all other schools of Islam, and is for this reason viciously persecuted by other Muslims, not stopping at murder, especially in Pakistan, and even in the diaspora, as we have seen. Following the incident, it became evident in a matter of days that the arson was not the work of ‘Islamophobes,’ as many both within and outside the Muslim ‘community’ no doubt hoped. Following the arrests, a spokesman for the Metropolitan Police announced that ‘there was nothing to suggest that this was a hate crime’ By law, the names of the two arrested juveniles were not released to the public. But if they had been, the odds are that they would have established that their crime was indeed a religious hate crime, but since it was the product of the hatred of the followers of one version of Islam for another, it was not classified as such. However, as we have already seen, this is exactly how the police defined the murder of the Glasgow Amadiyyah Muslim in March 2016.

The previous month, on February 18, 2016, these hatreds had already moved up a gear when a Rochdale imam, 71-year-old Jalal Uddin, was murdered in a deserted school playground as he made his way home from his local mosque. His skull had been smashed with a hammer. Again, the same question: could this be a ‘hate murder’ by one or more Islamophobes? Again, the same answer. Nine days later, police announced they had arrested, and charged with murder and conspiracy to commit murder, a Muslim student, 21-year-old Mohammed Hussein Syeedy. A 17-year-old male previously arrested on suspicion of murder was released on police bail. At Syeedy’s trial, it was established that the imam’s murder, like that of countless other Muslims, was motivated by theology. (Syeedy’s part in the murder had been to act as get-away driver. The actual killer, Mohammed Abdul Kadir, fled to Turkey and then to the Islamic State in Syria.) Like millions of other Muslims, Uddin believed in the power of *taweez*, a magic that is supposed to work beneficial effects for those who subscribe to it. Other Muslims, in particular the purist Salafist sect, regard the practise of *taweez* as heretical, akin to apostasy. Hence Uddin’s murder. (As Obama says, Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance.) History plays the most perverse tricks. Having come closer than ever before to ending the centuries of violent strife between Christians in Northern Ireland, the UK was experiencing the sectarian loathings and violence of the Islamic world, in June 2022 triggering a theological dispute over a film made by Shi’a Muslims about the life of a daughter of Mohammed, with Sunni mobs across the UK enforcing its withdrawal by cinema chains showing it. As always, there were no arrests.

Outside of the Muslim family, where the programming begins, one of the most fertile incubators of the UK’s ‘home grown’ Jihadi industry was the Al Manaar Mosque in west London. Opened by Prince Charles (who else?) appropriately in the year of 9/11, it supplied from a 3,000-strong congregation more than its fair share of volunteer executioners for the Islamic State, including Westminster University Business graduate ‘Jihadi John’ aka Mohammed Emwazi, and two converts, his friend Alexe Kote and former drug dealer Aine Davis. Among others linked to a Jihadist cell led by Emwazi calling itself the ‘London Boys’ were Abdel-Majid Abdel Bary, last seen on Twitter holding up a severed head, the brothers

Flamur and Flatlam Shakalu, Hamza Parvez aka Abu Hamza al-Britani, Reza Afsharzadegan, Mohammed Nasser, engineering student Mohammed el-Araj and Ibrahim Magag. Those who fondly believe that so-called 'radicalised' Muslims can be weaned away from the path of terrorism by dangling before them the pleasures, comforts and material benefits afford by western civilisation, fail to understand that this is exactly what they are rebelling against when they assume the role and often as not, suffer fate of a Jihadi. What they see as the infidel's secular and materialist, and therefore decadent way of life genuinely revolts them. Those who harbour the delusion that aspiring Jihadis can be somehow persuaded to see western culture in a more favourable light, and even, perhaps, to partake (legally) of its pleasures, should read carefully the declaration issued by the Islamic State in support of the US Muslim couple who carried out the Saint Bernardino massacre of December 2, 2015, in which 14 were killed and another 22 seriously injured. They had 'proved they were willing to sacrifice what is dearest to them for the sake of responding to Allah', not only leaving behind their comfortable life style, but by 'leaving their baby daughter in the care of others knowing they likely wouldn't see her in this life again'.

Even the most cursory reading of the *Koran* will alight upon numerous passages that provide conclusive proof that the doctrine of *Jihad* is as integral to Islam as the resurrection of Christ is to Christianity or the Ten Commandments of Moses to Judaism. Are we to assume then that those who govern the western world have simply not bothered to apply themselves to the study of a text no less responsible for Islamic terrorism than was Hitler's *Mein Kampf* for the rise of Nazism and the Holocaust? If this is so, what then would they suggest could be the most likely motivation of the man French police arrested as a terrorist suspect in the vicinity of Euro Disney on January 28, 2016? He was carrying in a bag the following items: two guns, ammunition, a knife...and a *Koran*. Another case of 'you're no Muslim bruv'? The concern displayed by western politicians to totally separate what Jihadi Muslims believe and do in the name of their faith from what they want to convince their public is a 'religion of peace' frequently produces statements that border on the surreal. In due course, we will see in some detail the devastating impact fostering and acting on such lies about the nature of Islam can have on a small nation such as Sweden or a larger one such as Germany. In each of these two cases, the harm wrought has thus far been largely contained within their own borders. But when the deception is practised by a politician who holds the office of President of the most powerful nation in the world, the consequences for the security and freedoms of western civilisation become incalculable. It is for this reason alone, and not to score cheap and very easy points at the personal expense of a politician who in many other ways, I admire, that I explore this issue by way of an introduction to a number of related themes. In February 2016, in his first ever visit to a Mosque, President Obama dug out a truncated quotation from the *Koran* which he claimed proved that Islam, like other religions, 'summon[s] us to embrace our common humanity': 'Oh mankind, we have made you peoples and tribes that you may know each other'. As can be the case on such occasions, this quotation was incorrect; it should have read: 'Oh mankind, We have created you from male and female and made you tribe and subtribes that ye may know one another. (Chapter 49, Verse 14) What he did not read out, for patently obvious reasons, was the rest of the verse, which continues: 'Verily the most honourable among you, in the sight of Allah, is he who is the most righteous among you.' So, not all mankind, but

only the 'righteous', that is, *only Muslims*, can be considered worthy of being numbered among 'the most honourable in the sight of Allah', as also here: 'The believers are only those who truly believe in Allah and His Messenger but strive with their possessions and their persons [i.e., wage *Jihad*] in the cause of Allah.' (49: 16) And, again from the same Chapter, Verse 11: 'Surely all believers [sic] are brothers. So make peace between your brothers'.

Far from Islam 'summoning us to a common humanity' the *Koran* tells us that Allah has set himself the opposite goal, 'the day from Allah for which there will be no averting. On that day, believers and disbelievers will be *separated from each other*.' (30: 4, emphasis added) Chapter 42, Verse 9, has Allah relating to Mohammed how he has quite deliberately, and also it seems arbitrarily, chosen to exclude from Obama's 'common humanity' a certain portion of mankind: 'And if Allah had so willed, He could have made them one people; but He admits into His mercy whomsoever he pleases. The wrongdoers will have no help and no protector'; and Chapter 88, Verse 30: 'Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah. And those who are with him are hard against the disbelievers but tender among themselves.' And even in its truncated form, it is impossible to see how the verse partially quoted by Obama can be construed as a 'summons to embrace our common humanity'. To know is not necessarily to embrace. And whatever Obama might say, Islam regards those who do not convert or submit to its rule as enemies to be annihilated. That is why one searches in vain in the holy texts of Islam for Obama's 'summons'. Instead, we have the most bloodcurdling threats against those who resist Islam's march towards world conquest: 'Verily, we have prepared for the disbelievers chains and iron collars and blazing fire.' (76: 5) 'Those who reject the Book and that with which We sent Our Messenger, soon will they come to know, when the iron-collars will be around their necks, and chains too, and they will be dragged into boiling water; then in the Fire will they be burnt.' (40: 71-73)

We read in Chapter 44, Verses 45-50, how Allah's angels administer 'the food of the sinful' that 'like molten copper', 'will boil in their bellies as the boiling of scalding water', how they will 'seize him and drag him into the midst of the blazing fire' and then 'pour upon his head the torment of boiling water' and then taunt and mock him in his agony, saying 'taste it'. Verses 56 to 59 of Chapter 38 likewise gloat over the prospect of the torments that await 'the rebellious' in 'an evil place of return', one that in its contrived depravity, like all the rest bears an uncanny resemblance to the torture chambers of Saddam Hussein (See footnote to Appendix T): 'Hell, wherein they will burn. What an evil resting place. This is what they will have. So let them taste it - a boiling fluid, and an intensely cold and stinking drink.' In Verse 35 of Chapter 9, Christian clergy accused of hoarding gold are condemned to suffer agonies 'in the fire of Hell, their foreheads and their sides and their backs shall be branded and it shall be said to them; "This is what you hoarded for yourselves; so now take what you used to hoard."' (Was it such passages as these, so obviously the fantasies of a psychopath, that led Pope Francis II to insist that what he called a 'proper reading' of the *Koran* would reveal it to be, contrary to popular western prejudice, a book 'opposed to every [sic!] form of violence'?)

The verses cited above leave no room for doubt that that the only 'summons' on offer from Allah is the demand to submit to Islam (*Islam* translates as 'submission') or face the consequences, which can include a variety of barbaric tortures and deaths. As for Islam's understanding of what constitutes 'humanity', it is not the universal brotherhood of man that Obama would us believe, because it

can only be fully realised when Allah's children 'embrace' Islam as Muslims. There is of course the option, but only for monotheists, of submitting to its rule as *dhimmis*, the Arabic term that defines the status of monotheists who do not convert to Islam but are subject to a special tax and laws as second-class citizens: 'Fight those from among the People of the Book [the 'people' being Jews and Christians, the 'book' being the Bible], who believe not in Allah, nor in the Last Day, nor as unlawful what Allah and His Messenger have declared to be unlawful, nor follow the true religion, until they pay the tax considering it a favour [sic] and acknowledging their subjection.' (9: 29)

As surely Obama, reared in a partially Muslim family, must have known, Sharia law requires that those who decline this 'favour' must be killed. Non-monotheists do not even have the option of *dhimmitude*. It is a stark choice of convert or die. If this be the 'common humanity' of Islam, it bears not the remotest resemblance to the Liberty, Equality and Fraternity of the French Revolution, which in its aim, if not always its practice, truly embraced all mankind, irrespective of creed or colour. Other verses from the *Koran* leave no doubt as to the fate that awaits those who decline Islam's invitation to embrace their 'common humanity' under the benign rule of Allah. Over and again we are told that 'Allah does not love the unbelievers' (Chapter 3, Verse 33 and Chapter 30, Verse 46), and that he will 'cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve', 'smit[ing] them above the necks [sic] and smit[ing] off their fingertips. (Chapter 8, Verse 13) It is a strange kind of 'common humanity' that inflicts such savage punishments on those who prefer to share it in their own way. The Christian Obama's other Good Book even takes a sadistic pleasure at the prospect in store for such free spirits: 'We have prepared for the disbelievers a humiliating punishment (4: 152) and 'We have prepared for those of them that disbelieve a painful punishment.' (4: 162) When we get to Chapter 5, Verse 34, we again learn what this punishment involves for those who resist the way of Allah: 'The only reward for those who wage war against Allah and his messenger and strive to create disorder in the land is that they be slain or crucified or their hands and feet cut off on account of their enmity'. I ask again... is this the embracing of 'common humanity'? Before making such ill-informed claims, Obama should have taken the trouble to check out the pejorative meaning of the Arabic term *kuffar*, which Islam uses to denote those who reject the teachings of Allah as inscribed in the *Koran*, and with whom, therefore, Muslims cannot share a 'common humanity'. Chapter 49, Verse 10 is unambiguous on this point: 'The believers are but a single brotherhood'. But what of the six billion *kuffars* currently living on our planet who do not believe? 'As for those who disbelieve, I will punish them with a severe punishment in this world and in the next, and they shall have no helpers.' (3: 57)

Other verses have Allah revealing that he has quite arbitrarily chosen to exclude certain persons from this brotherhood: 'And upon Allah rests the showing of the right way, and there are ways that deviate from the right course. And if He had enforced his will, He would have guided you all.' (16: 10) 'Thus does Allah leave to go astray who he pleases and guide whom he pleases' (74: 32) and 'If Allah so willed, He could make you all one people: but he leaves straying whom he pleases, and He guides whom He pleases.' (Chapter 16, Verse 93) Perversely for someone who never tires of praising his own mercy, compassion and forgiveness, those so excluded through no choice or fault of their own from Obama's 'common humanity' are consigned by Allah to hell in an Islamic anticipation of Calvin's doctrine of 'double-predestination': 'If We had so willed, we could certainly have

brought every soul its true guidance: but the word from Me will come true: “I will fill Hell with Jinns and men all together”.’ (Chapter 32, Verse 13) For those who by his own choice reject his message, Allah again shows himself as a sadistic psychopath, as here: ‘Those who disbelieve in Our Signs, we shall soon cause them to enter Fire. As often as their skins are burnt up, we shall give them in exchange other skins that they may continue to taste the punishment. Surely Allah is Mighty and Wise.’ (4; 57 and ‘Those who disbelieve – their possessions and their children shall not avail them at all against Allah; and it is they who are the fuel of fire.’ (3: 11)

In view of his ethnic origins, Obama would have been well advised to take note of the racist undertones in Allah’s treatment of that most heinous of all crimes in the Islamic lexicon...apostasy: ‘As for those whose faces will be black, it will be said to them; “Did you disbelieve after believing? Taste, then, the punishment because you disbelieved. And for those whose faces will be white, they will be in the mercy of Allah; therein will they abide.’ (3: 107-8) The *Koran* could not be more explicit in the crucial matter of how Muslims should regard and treat those who do not share their own faith. We have Chapter 3, Verse 28: ‘Let not the believers take disbelievers for friends in preference to believers - and who does that has no connection with Allah - except that you guard yourselves full against them.’ (3:29); ‘Verily, the disbelievers are an open enemy to you.’ (4: 102); and Verse 119 of Chapter 3: ‘O ye who believe! Take not others than your own people as intimate friends; they will spare no pains to ruin you. They love to see you in trouble. Hatred has already shown itself through the utterances of their mouths and what their breasts hide is greater still. We have made it clear to you Our commandments, if only you will use your understanding.’ Clear indeed. But still not clear enough, it would seem, for the understanding of the President of the United States. In some verses, Allah specifies from whom in particular Muslims must keep their distance...that is, when they are not waging *jihad* against them: ‘O ye who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians as friends.’ (5: 52. This injunction occurs no fewer than six times in the *Koran*. Hardly a recipe for mutual religious tolerance.

In addition to Obama’s lamentable essay in D.I.Y. Islamic theology, there is the matter of the President’s choice of the mosque where he demonstrated his lack of qualifications in the subject. Reformist Muslims were dismayed that of all the options open to him, he plumbed for the ultra-conservative Islamic Society of Baltimore Mosque to deliver his address. Unlike some reformist Mosques, Baltimore’s segregates women from men, and with its connections to the Muslim Brotherhood, has a track record of preachers who support suicide bombing and promote vicious homophobia. Dr. Juhdi Jasser, founder of the American Islamic Forum for Democracy, said the Baltimore Mosque was ‘steeped in Salafism and ideology that is really incompatible with western identity.’ Suspicions were voiced that with the Presidential elections due in November, Obama was more concerned with soliciting the votes of the USA’s largely conservative Muslim electorate than encouraging reform trends within Islam.

Like Obama, Secretary of State John Kerry went beyond his job description (and also like Obama, crossed the divide defined in the First Amendment between state and religion) when, assuming the role of an Imam, Mufti or an Ayatollah, he accused the leaders of the Islamic State of ‘apostasy’ no less. They were ‘people who have hijacked a great religion’, being ‘nothing more than a mixture of killers, of kidnappers, of criminals, of thugs, of adventurers, of smugglers and thieves.’ Let us

start with killing. Perversely for such a benign faith, Islam is obsessed with killing and death. Killing is the prescribed penalty in the *Koran* and under Sharia law for, in addition to many other offences, the very crime Kerry accused the Islamic State of committing, namely apostasy. So if Kerry was serious about his accusation of apostasy, then to be consistent, he should also have demanded that it be punished as Islamic law requires and is in fact carried out in a Muslim state, Saudi Arabia, with which his government enjoyed the most cordial relations, and on a scale only exceeded by Iran.. As in the above citations, killing is also a prescribed method for dealing with the enemies of Allah, and in the course of this work, the reader will encounter yet more citations from Islamic texts, including more from the *Koran*, that prove this to be the case. Did Kerry really believe that Islam and killing are incompatible, and therefore all genuine Muslims are pacifists? As for ‘kidnapping’, usually of young women and girls as practised by Boko Haram as well as the Islamic State, it is not only sanctioned in the *Koran* and by Kerry’s own religion, in the Old Testament, but is in both cases followed by rape and, if the captor wishes, in the case of Islam, by enforced concubinage, and in the Bible, by enforced marriage. (I will cite texts proving this in due course)

What of Kerry’s ‘criminals, adventurers, smugglers and thieves’? Those who are familiar with Muslim accounts of the prophet’s life will recognise at once in these pejorative epithets the founder of the Religion of Peace. The story of Mohammed’s life of murder, rape, plunder, paedophilia, torture, kidnap, deceit, enslavement and conquest is, Muslims believe, faithfully (and proudly) recorded in his first and therefore regarded as his most reliable biography, by Ibn Ishaq’s *The Life of Mohammed*. (See Appendix L) compiled from various sources shortly after the prophet’s death in 632. I strongly recommend that Kerry, and anyone else for that matter who shares his illusions, should first consult this work, together of course with the *Koran*, before lecturing the world on what is and is not the true Islam. The more mainstream politicians and the media deny this so obvious connection, not between all Muslims and terrorism, but between *Islam* and terrorism, the more will space open up for previously marginal politicians, movements and parties who are only too willing to do just that to further their own racist and authoritarian agendas. There is a long and essentially healthy, if sometimes abused tradition of the public respecting anyone who, in their judgment, is prepared to tell what they believe to be an obvious truth...and in this particular case it is the truth...when the ‘establishment’ is, for whatever reason, telling lies. Like nature, politics abhors vacuums. It is this sentiment that right across Europe and in the USA has fed the growth of parties opposed to mass Muslim immigration, including those who are genuine asylum seekers, and, as a corollary, has also fuelled disenchantment with a European Union that has done little if anything to bring it under control by enforcing its own rules on asylum. It helped to propel the billionaire maverick isolationist Donald Trump into the White House, and transformed Brexit campaigner Nigel Farage into a mainstream politician, in both cases with more than a little help from Germany’s Chancellor Angela Merkel and the Islamic State.

This swing to the populist right cannot be combatted by telling lies, lies that with each repetition, are belied by the evidence and consequently simply feed the fears and suspicions they are intended to counter. And yet that is exactly what President Obama did in his lamentably dishonest response to the Orlando massacre, in which all the evidence conclusively proved that the assassin’s hatred of gays was

motivated by Islamic teachings on homosexuality. Instead of placing the blame there, where it belonged, Obama insisted that ‘we have no definite assessment on the motivation’, other than ‘we know that he was a person filled with hate’. That was not true. In the heat of the slaughter, the killer still found time to phone emergency services to tell them that ‘I did it for ISIS. I did it for the Islamic State.’ (Not as a protest against Obama’s foreign policy.) Obama would have been among the first to be made aware of this message, so surely he must have known that sooner or later, this would become public knowledge, which in fact it did in a matter of a few hours. So why the pretence that that ‘we have no definite assessment on the motivation’? This was not only dishonest. It fuelled the claims of those like Trump who had already been trying to convince the US public, and with some success, that Obama and his potential replacement, Hilary Clinton, were so hamstrung by political correctness that they were incapable of identifying, let alone combatting, the threat to US security being mounted by Islamic terrorism. Instead, Obama preferred to talk in vague terms about ‘hate’ and Hilary Clinton about the need for tighter gun controls. Yes, but was it a conventional infidel homophobe that pulled the trigger? Whence came the motivation that led to a Muslim’s gun being used to mow down dozens of gays at a night club? Obama knew the answer, but he preferred not to give it. The cannons of political correctness required that the source of that ‘hate’, like that of ‘terror’, on Obama’s lips dared not speak its name. Rather than put the cause and therefore the blame where it lay, with the homicidal hatred of Islam (though not of all Muslims) for homosexuals, Obama declared that all Americans ‘needed the strength to change’ in their attitude to LGTB communities, as if the majority of non-Muslim Americans had not already done so with their acceptance, if not necessarily in every case approval, of the introduction of sweeping reforms in sexual matters over the previous decade and more, many of which had been endorsed by Obama both personally and in his capacity as President.

The truth is, there is not one Islamic state that has taken a single step towards matching the tolerance displayed in the USA and the west generally, both in law and in attitudes, towards those whose sexual preferences and life styles depart from the norms laid down, and in the realm of Allah, brutally enforced, by the world’s monotheisms. Obama knew this more than almost anyone else, because every time his delegation to the United Nations had attempted to secure the passing of a resolution in the General Assembly condemning the killing of homosexuals and other sexual minorities, it had been blocked by the combined efforts of all the Islamic states. It is difficult to see how they could have done any differently, given what their religion has to say about the subject. Because like the Old and New Testaments of the Bible, the *Koran* is quite specific in its condemnation of homosexuality: ‘For ye practice your lusts upon men in preference to women: ye are indeed a people transgressing beyond limits.’ (7: 81) Several *hadith* record what Muslims scholars hold to be the prophet’s prescribed punishment for homosexual acts, for example: ‘The prophet said; “If you find anyone doing as Lot’s people did, kill the one who does it, and the one to whom it is done.’ (Sunan Abu Dawood: 38: 4447) All polls conducted on this subject come up with the same results: nearly all Muslims, largely irrespective of whether they live in an Islamic state or in the diaspora, condemn homosexuality as immoral, and believe it should be made illegal, and not many fewer believe that it should be punished with death as Sharia law requires and is in fact implemented in ten states: Yemen, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran,

Mauritania, Qatar (venue for the 2022 World Cup) United Arab Emirates, Sudan, Somalia, Nigeria and in Afghanistan under the Taliban This was the reality Obama was only too well aware of, but could not bring himself to publicly acknowledge.

Some of the arguments advanced to distance terrorism from religious fanaticism defy the most basic common sense, not to speak of evidence and logic, and not all of them are the work of politicians. Awarded the 2016 Templeton Prize (worth £1.1 million) for what the religious foundation described as his work in tackling the spread of religious violence, the former Chief Rabbi of the UK, Jonathan Sacks, though tactfully not specifying Islam, acknowledged that ‘today the most powerful religious voices are coming from the extremes’. These (unidentified) voices were ‘speaking to young idealistic kids and turning them into murderers’. Absolutely true, so long as we are talking about Islam. But then, in the next breath, Sacks located the source of religiously inspired terrorism in a reaction against secularism: ‘We really need to connect young people to the sources of positive idealism, and I am afraid those voices have tended to be screened out [sic] by what I see as a self-indulgent secular culture of the west right now.’ His diagnosis, which bore an uncanny resemblance to what the ‘voices coming from the extremes’ were saying, was that because the West is secular, it is also materialist, corrupt, pleasure loving. Sack’s homily on what he saw as the failings of western civilisation could have come just easily from a sermon by an Islamic State imam; namely, that, what the world needs, and especially the young, is more faith, more idealism, more self-sacrifice, a repudiation of the pleasures of this world and a joyful anticipation of the rewards of next. (See Appendices J and M.) I find this response of Rabbi Sacks to Islamic terrorism at odds with his excellent contribution to an anthology on contemporary anti-Semitism published in 2002, where he skilfully and eloquently lays bare its dual nature as both a secular *and* religious phenomenon, directed against Jews both for their faith and their race.

Not only clerics but politicians were at their limited wits’ end as to how to discourage from joining the Islamic State those young Muslims who believed, with good reason, it was what it called itself. Labour MP Khalid Mahmood put the number from the UK at 1,500, by far the largest European contingent, while an additional 600 had been apprehended *en route*. While Sacks offered more faith and self-denial, Cameron, with his proposal for more Muslim mortgages, went down the path of material comforts deplored by the former Chief Rabbi. Yet Muslim home ownership, at 52%, differs only marginally from that of Buddhists at 54%, but so far as I am aware, no UK Buddhist has been convicted of terrorist crimes, whereas hundreds of UK Muslims certainly have, a fair percentage of whom, given their predominately middle-class background, must surely have grown up in families which owned their own homes. According to data released by Cameron’s Home Office on September 12, 2013, between September 2001 and August 2012, that is, before the spate of arrests and trials that followed the rise of the Islamic State, of the 241 persons convicted of terrorism offences in the UK, those *known to be* Muslims numbered 175, that is, a little over 72% of the total. In the year ending in June 2017, arrests for terrorist offences reached a record high of 378, an average of more than one a day, up by a third from 226 the previous year. Of those arrested, 91% were avowed Muslims. Yet Muslims comprised only 4% of the UK population and of those over 15, even less. Muslims were therefore over-represented among suspected terrorists by factor of 22. As the rest of the UK population, 96%, accounted for the remaining 9% of terrorist suspects, being under-represented by a

factor of 10, at the very least therefore, a Muslim was 220 times more likely to be a terrorist suspect than a non-Muslim. The religion of peace.

Now we come to another of the main themes of this work, the relationship of the far left to the Jihadi offensive against the west. (See Chapter 13 for a definition of this term.) With the prospect looming of the UK joining, however reluctantly, with France and the USA in striking back against the orchestrators of the Paris massacres of November 2015, Corbyn's 'Stop the War Coalition' took to the streets pleading 'Don't Bomb Syria', knowing full well that the intended target was not 'Syria' but the clerical fascists of the Islamic State, while the SWP's on-line *Socialist Worker* called upon 'the left' to 'stand against Islamophobia', as if this phantom creation of the politically correct was the enemy, and not Islamic Jihadism, and to 'demand that this tragedy [sic...not atrocity] not be an excuse for more war'; in other words, exactly as Corbyn demanded, to oppose any and all actions against those responsible for the Paris massacres.

On December 4, 2015, Corbyn attended a Stop the War rally at his North Islington constituency's Saudi-funded Finsbury Park Mosque, (which on September 11, 2002, celebrated the first anniversary 9/11), the purpose of which was not to call upon its congregation to denounce the Paris massacres and Jihadi terrorism, but to protest against...Islamophobia. So how galling it must have been for the Sharia left to behold the scenes at Wembley Stadium when, only a matter of days after the Paris killings, England supporters, in an unprecedented act of true internationalism, joined with their French counterparts in singing the *Marseillaise* to demonstrate not their determination to 'stand against Islamophobia' - it is difficult to imagine anything that could have been further from their minds - but their solidarity with the French in their resistance to Islamic State terrorism. The following weekend, in football stadia all around the UK, the French anthem rang out again, helped along by its verses displayed on giant screens, while fans held aloft the French tricolour, truly a dispiriting sight and sound for any Sharia leftist still hoping to persuade the masses that the enemy was Islamophobia and not Jihadi Islam, and for the columnist in the impeccably politically correct *Washington Post*, who warned that such displays of international solidarity with the embattled French could be seen as 'an endorsement of the far right'. English football fans singing the *Marseillaise*, in French, and somehow acquiring at short notice and displaying the flag of England's ancient enemy, was *far right*? This is the depth to which Sharia Thought had reduced swathes of the leftist intelligentsia.

Stung into action by a revolt amongst Labour MPs and even within Corbyn's shadow cabinet against his policy of appeasing the Islamic State, the Corbynista Momentum swung into action, deploying the street tactics adopted during the Gaza conflicts of 2014 and 2023-24, only this time, the targets were not Jewish, but the homes of Labour MPs who had expressed their support for the bombing of the Islamic State. The absurdity of Corbyn's advocacy of a 'negotiated settlement' was once again demonstrated when one of the intended participants in this 'peace process' released a video showing five children each executing an Islamic State captive, four by shooting, the fifth, by decapitation, as recommended in the *Koran*, Chapter Eight, verse Thirteen, and as attempted at a London tube station and outside Woolwich barracks. Meanwhile, in the West Bank, *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida*, the official daily of the Palestinian Authority, took time out on November 15 from glorifying the murderers of Jewish civilians to attribute the Paris atrocities, as it had previously the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre, to a cunning plot executed by the Jews, more

precisely, by Israeli Intelligence, an accusation that also proliferated on the website of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, one of whose Patrons, as of 2023, was former Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn, and on that of Palestine Live, one of whose secret members was, from 2013 to 2015, also former Labour Leader, Jeremy Corbyn (see Appendix T):

It is not a co-incidence that human blood was exploded in Paris at the same time as certain sanctions are beginning to be implemented against [Jewish West Bank] settlement products and while France leads Europe in advising the security council that will implement the two-state solution, Palestine and Israel - which the Israelis see as a warning of sudden danger coming from the direction of Europe, where the Zionist, occupying settling endeavour was born...The wise thing to do is to look at who benefits. In short, they need to search the last place reached by the octopus's arms of Mossad [a classic Nazi image also used by Arab cartoonists] It is clear that its Mossad will also burn Beirut [see below] and Paris in order to achieve Netanyahu's goals. He, who challenged the master of the White House, hides in his soul enough evil to burn the world.

Now, thanks to the vigilance of the Palestinian Authority, the truth was out. It was eight Jews, disguised as Muslim Jihadis and crying Allah is Great, who as one arm of the Zionist octopus, unleashed the Paris massacres, just as earlier the same day, another arm, two Jewish suicide bombers, slaughtered 43 Shi'a Muslims in the crowded streets of Beirut. And this was only the beginning. Israel's Prime Minister 'hides in his soul enough evil to burn the world'. The 'world Jewish conspiracy', the phantom pursued by anti-Semites down the ages, and which for the Nazis justified the Holocaust, was evidently everywhere upon and among us. Perhaps inspired by the example of their fellow Jihadis in Paris and for sure urged on by this same Palestinian Authority, assassins claimed five victims in a matter of hours on the West Bank and in Israel, including two Jews gunned down while at prayer in a Synagogue. On the same day, on the southern frontier of the Islamic empire, in faraway Mali, Muslims crying, as per Jihadi protocol, God is Great, stormed a hotel in Bamako, taking 170 hostages, who were then, again according to protocol, tested on their knowledge of the *Koran*. Those who failed met the usual fate. Yet another suicide mission ended with at least 27 dead, one that, like all the others, despite all appearances to the contrary, nevertheless had nothing to do with Islam. To round off a busy week for the Religion of Peace, a PEW poll of eleven countries (which did not include Saudi Arabia) with large Muslim populations indicated growing support for the Islamic State, with those Muslims favourable or undecided ranging from 16% in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to 34% in (only 45% Muslim) Nigeria and 62% in Pakistan...So much for 'tiny minorities'.

And what was Corbyn's answer to this orgy of Jihadi violence? In what was so obviously, a *pro forma* message of sympathy to the French President, Corbyn took it upon himself to advise Francois Hollande, who had earlier declared 'we are going to lead a war that will be pitiless', 'not to be drawn into responses which feed a cycle of violence and hatred'; in other words, to do nothing. To fight back was to share the guilt, such as it was. As he had previously made clear, instead of military action, Corbyn's policy was still to seek a 'political solution' with those who ordered the Paris and Beirut massacres. All he had to offer was the 'hope [soon to be dashed] that such a terrible event [sic...not atrocity] doesn't happen in London or indeed in any other city anywhere in the world.' Hope! So why not faith (in Islam's peaceful

intentions) and charity (towards its misunderstood Jihadis). Corbyn was at least consistent in his refusal to take on the Jihadis. Having ruled out military action against the Islamic State, he was also opposed to an armed response to terrorists on the streets of the UK: 'I'm not happy [sic] with the shoot to kill policy. I think it is quite dangerous. I think it can often be counterproductive.' Was it then 'counterproductive' when French police saved countless lives by shooting dead the driver of the lorry that on Bastille Day 2016 was mowing down scores of revellers on a Nice promenade? Did he really think that letting Jihadis know that there would be no armed response to their terror attacks somehow prevents them? Why, unlike all other political leaders, did Corbyn extend his token 'solidarity' only to 'the people of Nice and their emergency services', that is, medical staff, and not to the people and government of France, and its embattled security forces? Could it be because Corbyn, along with his Sharia left comrades of the 'Stop the War Coalition', was opposed to the participation by France in military attacks on the Islamic State, and favoured instead a 'peace process' with its clerical fascist Caliphate?

Incredibly, during a televised Labour leadership hustling with Corbyn in July 2016, his opponent, Owen Smith, in an obvious but as it proved futile bid to ingratiate himself with the Corbynista wing of the party, endorsed his opponent's previously declared support for engaging in a 'peace process' with the Islamic State, arguing that 'ultimately, all solutions to these international crises do come about through dialogue'. Really? Chamberlain certainly thought so. But that is not how the world rid itself of the menace of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. Had Smith forgotten that the challenge to Corbyn's leadership began with Shadow Foreign Secretary Hilary Benn's speech in the House of Commons in support of bombing raids on what he described as the fascist regime that ruled the Islamic State? In the same hustling, Corbyn, presented with a not-to-be-missed opportunity to appear for once as the voice of sanity, opposed Smith's absurd proposal, despite his not only having consistently opposed any military action against ISIS, but having himself recommended, on January 17, 2016 using what he called a 'back channel' to the Islamic State to arrive at a 'political solution in Syria'. This was one of several instances of Smith attempting to win the leadership contest by out-Corbyning Corbyn. But he drew the line at leaving NATO. At the next hustling confrontation, Corbyn was challenged no less than four times to say whether as Prime Minister he would honour Article Five of NATO's Washington Treaty, which obligates all its members to come to the aid of any member if attacked. It had previously been invoked only once, in response to 9/11. Corbyn, who had declared his intention to withdraw from NATO, declined to answer, instead offering worthless pacifist platitudes: 'I don't wish to go to war - what I want to do is achieve a world where we don't need to go to war', as did Tory Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and Labour Leader from 1932 to 1935 George Lansbury. (See Appendices T and VIII) His silence regarding the Washington Treaty was understandable. In January 2011, Corbyn was filmed at a public rally denouncing NATO as 'a danger to world peace' and insisting that the left had to 'campaign against NATO's power, its influence and its global reach'. Putin could not have put it more succinctly. And in the meantime, while the world waited for Corbyn to rid it of war? This urge to disarm in the face of the UK's potential and actual enemies extended, in the case of his Shadow Chancellor, John McDonnell, to domestic policy. Prior to the General Election of May 2015, he signed a twelve-point manifesto, the last item of which demanded

that a Labour government should 'disband MI5 and special police squads and disarm the police'. Yet McDonnell not only lyingly denied having signed the Manifesto, but ever having seen it, even though the *Sun* newspaper published a photo of him proudly posing with its final printed version.

Appeasement of Jihadism was not only rampant on the left. Days before the Paris massacres, a devoutly Lutheran and conservative German Chancellor, the Christian Democrat Leader Angela Merkel, told a growing number of Germans apprehensive of the possible negative consequences of the unrestricted (and therefore illegal) flow of Muslims into their country, that they had nothing to fear from Islam. To calm such fears, she recommended that they should study their Bibles as Muslims do their *Koran* (that is, the 43% of Muslims, most of whom are men, who can read) and go to church more often. Religion was not the cause of such fears, but the cure. There was no need for alarm at the prospect of Germany's already four million strong Muslim population continuing to multiply because 'Islam belongs to Germany'. And Germany could belong to Islam, with judges ruling as legal Sharia law patrols in the Ruhr city of Wuppertal. Clad in smart orange uniforms, with 'Sharia Police' emblazoned on the back, young Salafi Muslims were targeting the public drinking of alcohol, gambling and music-making, in fact anyone having a good time. They could be seen at work on a YouTube video. One of their number was the Muslim convert cleric Sven Lau, who had his passport seized after returning from the Islamic State, where he posed for a photo sitting on a tank brandishing a Kalashnikov machine gun. He was subsequently seen patrolling German streets enforcing the laws of Allah. Not that Merkel was alone in believing that a theological soft-soaping of Islam was the way to a Jihadi's heart. A Swedish Bishop removed the cross over her church to make it more 'welcoming' to local Muslims. I can just see then eagerly piling in, clutching their hymn books. In the same (futile) ecumenical spirit, the Anglican Bishop of London recommended that clergymen grew beards to make them more Muslim-friendly. Surely a spoof you say? No, it is true. But could these gestures of friendship, some might say, submission, work? According to the International Society for Human Rights, more than 200 Christians are killed *every day* by Muslims across the Islamic world. Anglican bishops collectively demanded that the UK accept 50,000 migrants whose holy book instructs them not to take Christians as friends and to make war on unbelievers, but they have not displayed a similar compassion for the Christian victims of Muslim persecution in Asia, the Middle East and Africa. After muted, apologetic and token protests at the systematic slaughter of their Christian brethren, western clerics invariably subside into a fearful silence. Given their resources and following, why has there has not been held one single public protest rally, or demonstration, on the streets of a western capital, against the Holocaust being visited on Christians and Yazidis in the world of Islam? Could it be that the Christian establishment wishes at all costs, including that that of the betrayal of their martyred co-religionists, to avoid being accused of the ultimate sin of Islamophobia?

We were assured after each Islamic atrocity that all but a 'tiny minority' of Muslims disprove of the activities of the Islamic State, and more generally, of terrorism as such, a claim belied by a number of surveys on the subject. But that is not my main point. If the rejection by UK Muslims of the Islamic State is so overwhelming, why was it that the number of Muslim public demonstrations in the UK against atrocities perpetrated by the Islamic State on fellow Muslims (or

anybody else for that matter) could be counted on the thumb of one hand, (though one more it is true than any by the Sharia left) and that the number of those participating amounted to less than half of those UK Muslims that have volunteered to fight for it? Hardly surprising when a former Harvard Professor of Islamic Studies, Faried Essack, reacted to the November 2015 Paris murder of 130 civilians by his co-religionists by declaring: 'I am not praying for Paris; I am not condemning anyone. Why the hell should I? I had nothing to do with it. I am sickened by the perpetual expectations to condemn. I walk away from your shitty racist and Islamophobic expectations that whenever your chickens come to roost then I must feign [sic] horror.' If not in so many words, all victims of Jihadi terror 'had it coming', whether they be men, women, teenagers, children or babies. (See Chapter 9) This, not from a Hamas preacher, *but a US academic*. Muslims will take to streets in their millions in often violent protests over a video or a cartoon they have not seen, or a novel they have not, and in most cases, could not have read, and which harm no-one, yet not only the murder of *kuffars*, but of their own co-religionists by fellow Muslims leaves them unmoved. And this is the faith of Allah the *compassionate*?

Even after the Paris atrocities, Merkel still failed to comprehend that her refusal to enforce Germany's and the EU's asylum laws had placed not only her own country but all Europe in great danger, not to speak of the golden opportunity it afforded rightist populists to present themselves by default as the lone defenders of Western civilisation. And French police did indeed confirm, just as the politically incorrect had predicted, that at least two assassins had entered Europe posing as refugees fleeing from the fighting in Syria. According to a Greek Government Minister, Nikos Toscas, one arrived in a boat from Turkey at the Greek island of Leros on October 13, 2015: 'We do not know if [his] passport was checked by other countries through which the holder likely passed'. Unlike Merkel, France acted legally when the State of Emergency proclaimed after the Paris massacres entitled its government to deny entry to 3,414 would-be migrants deemed by Interior Minister Bernard Cazeneuve to be a risk to 'security and public order'. With good reason, because ISIS had declared that it would use the migrant crisis to infiltrate thousands of Jihadis into Europe. Checked or not, one assassin was illegally waved through on his way to his murderous mission, via Greece, Macedonia, Serbia, Croatia, Hungary, Austria, through Merkel's open door into Germany and then on into France. A conference of European police officials held in September 2015 estimated that possibly as many as 5,000 European nationals were currently fighting for the Islamic State in Syria and Iraq. Many were expected to return to wage *Jihad* in their countries of origin.

Political correctors and cultural relativists assert that the West has no entitlement to find fault with cultures other than its own because of its sins of past and present, from the Crusades, when Christian warriors sought to reclaim land and peoples conquered (or is it liberated?) by the armies of the religion of peace, to military operations in Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria against the same foe. Like the first sin of Adam, the misdeeds of Richard the Lion Heart, together those of the slave trade and empire, Bush and Blair, must therefore be visited on all subsequent generations to and beyond the present to the infinite future, as indeed is argued by the 'Social Justice' movement in the USA. However, Islam's slave trade and wars of conquest naturally escape such censure, as do practises sanctioned by its scripture that if indulged in by infidels, would be universally condemned in the West as barbaric.

A Nigerian friend of mine was shouted down at a supposedly academic conference on the slave trade for having the temerity to point out that Muslims practised slavery on a scale no less vast and cruel as Christians. Even the highly respected website Statista displayed the same blind spot when on August 23, 2022, to mark the International Day for the Remembrance of the Slave Trade, it published a map which purported to show 'where African enslaved peoples came from'. In fact, the map, and the statistics that accompanied it, only related to the transatlantic slave trade. No information was provided concerning either the trans-Saharan or Barbary slave trade, which was operated, not by Christians, but exclusively by Muslims. The same omission mars *The Slave Trade* by Hugh Thomas, where, in its 925 pages, contrary to what one expects from its title, the reader will only find 12 references to the same trade conducted by Muslims. True, the book is subtitled, '*The History of the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1440-1870*'. As the main title is misleading, this should be the only title, because the trade was as much a Muslim business as a Christian one, in fact more so, because it began much earlier, and continues to this day.

In another exercise in politically correct history, the Germans were instructed by Chancellor Merkel to bite their tongues when confronted with what they may have seen as the misbehaviour of her Muslim guests. They were reminded never to forget that although those who perpetrated the Holocaust of the Jews (what Holocaust, some of her guests would have asked) are long gone, their crimes have been inherited by their children and grandchildren, and this required that they suffer such shortcomings in silence and with due contrition. (See Chapter 22) Yet it was Merkel who, in contravention of her own country's constitution (Article 16 B, subsection 2) and the Dublin III Regulation on asylum, by inviting into Germany unlimited followers of a faith that fosters a hatred of Jews no less virulent and murderous than that of the Nazis, was herself responsible for a surge of Muslim anti-Semitism that necessitated the appointment of a government minister to combat it, and the stationing of armed guards outside all Germany's synagogues.

As the reader will gather as they proceed, my treatment of this work's subject matter is at times admittedly discursive and occasionally repetitive, as it has been written over a period of nine years, largely in response to ongoing events, beginning with the Hamas attack on Israel in 2014, continuing with the anti-Semitic scandals surrounding Jeremy Corbyn that followed and resulted from his election as Labour Party Leader in September 2015, and concluding with two assaults on western civilisation, Putin's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 and the Gaza war of 2023-24. Throughout, the main focus is on the partly symbiotic relationship that has evolved over the last four decades between what will be treated, of necessity rather broadly and loosely, as a substantial part of the more radical political left, and reactionary movements and regimes, mainly, but not only, those organised on Islamic principles. Naturally, a study of this kind relies heavily on textual references. The sceptical reader...and readers of polemics such as this should be sceptical...will possibly ask themselves the following question: even assuming that the texts cited are authentic, to what extent are they 'selective' and therefore not to be trusted as true indicators of their author's or speaker's beliefs. To which I reply: Firstly, all the citations are, so far as I have been able to establish, authentic, being those of primary and not secondary sources. Nothing has been made up or doctored. Quotations from religious texts, in the first place the *Koran*, have been given chapter and verse, so that any reader can check them for themselves. Secondly, to answer the chief objection; all quotations, by definition, involve a process of

selection, and are therefore *ipso facto*, 'selective'. Mine are no different. There is no way round this. The only alternative is to avoid quotations altogether and instead bombard the reader with unsubstantiated, 'sweeping generalisations' that no intelligent reader will or should take seriously.

There are occasions in this work when I have occasion to contest what I, consider to be two of the most pernicious intellectual fallacies of our times, both being derivatives of post-modernism; cultural relativism, and its analogue, moral relativism. According to their reasoning, all moral judgments are subjective, so one culture cannot be judged to be superior or inferior to any other. It therefore follows that what many in West will see as an injustice practised by a culture other their own - for example, the traditional Chinese binding of girls' feet, the Hindu burning alive of widows, or placing multiple hoops round the necks of African girls - should not be seen as violations of so-called universal values and human rights, since these are in reality subjective 'values' and 'rights' that western imperialism has imposed on the rest of the world. Instead, such practices must be judged by the norms of the culture in question. The cultural and moral relativism engendered by this repudiation of universal humanism so warps the thinking of even quite intelligent, decent and reasonably well-educated people that they find themselves unable to condemn the most horrific crimes when committed in cultures other than their own, the prime example being that of Islam and its integral Jew-hatred and barbaric treatment of women, many examples of which I cite in this work. Moreover, they also feel compelled to denounce those that do publicly condemn such crimes as racists, Islamophobes and apologists for imperialism, or, after the example set by the late Professor Edward Said, 'Orientalists'. (See Chapter 21)

Perhaps the most extreme, and at the same time, in view of who subscribed to this mode of thinking, alarming instance is again, that of US President Barack Obama. And again, not by accident, it finds him deferring to Islam. In a speech at Cairo University, the most prestigious in the entire Islamic world, after ingratiating himself with his audience with the fiction that 'Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance' (see above), he then demanded that 'Western countries' should reciprocate by not 'impeding Muslim citizens from practising their religion as they see fit - for instance, by dictating what clothes a woman should wear.' Muslim men, however, *can* dictate to Muslim women not only what they can wear but virtually everything else about their lives, precisely because they are 'practising their religion as they see fit'. The example Obama provided was well-chosen, because Islamic dress rules (which do not apply to men) are far from the worst that can befall a Muslim woman. He could just as easily have cited other examples of Islamic 'life style' that westerners, following his argument, should accommodate, if not necessarily approve of. Why not wife beating and marital rape, both, as we shall see, sanctioned by the *Koran*? Or likewise the amputation of hands and feet for theft? Child marriage and female genital mutilation, which, citing the prophet, *Hadiths* prescribe and which has been inflicted on at least 90% of his host's female population? The putting to death of apostates, adulterers and homosexuals? Slavery? Polygamy? Sexual intercourse with a minor (statutory rape in the USA)? Polygamy?

Taking Obama at his word - and why should we do otherwise, for Obama is an honourable man - we are led to the inescapable conclusion that the guardian of the US Constitution, like the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, was in effect advocating two parallel systems of law, only not, like Williams, just for his

own country, but the for the entire western world; the existing one for infidels, and another, in effect Sharia law, that will enable diaspora Muslims, or at least Muslim men, to practise their religion ‘as they see fit’ in the lands of the infidel, as they do in Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan, Sudan, Yemen, Afghanistan and the Islamic State, to give but seven of many choice examples. Had it not occurred to Obama that the 19 devout Muslims who carried out the *kamikaze* attacks on 9/11 were doing exactly as he said; that is ‘practising their religion as they saw fit’? Had Obama been President the time, and been forewarned of the impending attack, would he then have given orders to his military not to ‘impede’ it? Why, as Obama did to his credit, did he hunt down and order the killing of Osama Bin Laden who, when all is said and done, was also ‘practising his religion as he saw fit’ by orchestrating the attack on the World Trade Centre? What Obama no doubt intended as a conciliatory gesture to the world’s Muslims would, in his own country, result in one half of its Muslim population foregoing the protection of the law from being raped and beaten by their husbands, genitally mutilated by their female relatives and marrying before the age stipulated by US laws. This dual system of jurisprudence would, it necessarily followed, have required that Sharia courts exclusively assumed the responsibility of supervising those otherwise illegal practices that Muslims ‘see fit’ to engage in, including for example, the re-introduction of slave-owning, abolished in 1863 by President Lincoln. Needless to say, for all Obama’s ‘proud tradition of tolerance’, Islam does not now and never will for as long as it upholds the *Koran* as the word of Allah, extend the same latitude to non-Muslim *dhimmis* living under its rule.

Such cultural and moral relativism, manifested not only in the White House, but on Anglo-Saxon campuses by the increasingly intimidatory politics of ‘identity’ and ‘entitlement’, in which the quest for objective truth is subverted by the claims of race and gender, so long as they are not those of white male heterosexuals, constitutes an assault on the Enlightenment principle that the arbiter of truth is reason and evidence, not ‘identity’ and ‘feelings’, and that there exist and need to be upheld universal human rights and values that transcend location, faith, gender, and race. Is it any wonder that the only serious political discussions today are being conducted among a small circle of dissident liberals and leftists?

There have been previous occasions in history when the role of reason in human affairs has been subjected to a similar assault, in what one analyst has called ‘the revolt against reason’, and another, the rejection of the ‘critical spirit and its manifestations’ in favour of ‘intuitive feelings, emotions, enthusiasms, an unthinking spontaneity’, what the mid-19th century German materialist philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach described as ‘the omnipotence of the heart’, which ‘breaks through [i.e., overrides] all limits of the understanding, which soars above all the boundaries of nature’, ‘before which no [scientific] law, no eternal conditions, avail or subsist.’ The result is the creation in the minds especially of the young and increasingly in society at large, a world where reason and evidence count for nothing, and feeling and ‘identity’ everything, for example, one in which a biological man who because he ‘feels’ he is a woman (how does he know how a woman ‘feels?’) is actually legally transformed into one. And absurd as it may sound to those for whom modern history is a closed book, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that out of an unstable mix of identity politics, genderism, white male-baiting, manufactured victimhood, dissent-silencing thuggery, group-think, ‘ways of knowing’, and anti-intellectualism, could emerge a *sui generis*

totalitarianism. (I wrote this in 2016. Less than a decade on, this prediction has been confirmed.)

To take one example: It is not by accident that when it comes to its anti-Zionism, the far left has found itself, on some occasions, as we shall see, not only knowingly but willingly, marching in step with the far right, as it also has in matters of geopolitics, by their mutual endorsement of Putin's pan-Slav expansionism. (See Appendix XIV) Studies of the period and subject have demonstrated beyond any dispute that in France and Italy, it was not conservatives, who albeit in some case reluctantly, had come to terms with the workings of liberal democracy, but anti-democratic leftist intellectuals, socialists, syndicalists and anarchists, of whom Mussolini is only one example of many, who pioneered and provided most of the ideas and main cadres of fascism, nearly all of them being anti-Semitic to one degree or another. Prominent amongst these were in France Georges Sorel, Georges Valois, Gustave Hervé, Henri Barbé, Pierre Celor and Jacques Doriot (these last three being former leading communists who founded the fascist Parti Populaire Français); in Italy the left socialist Mussolini, the communist Nicolo Bombacci and the syndicalist Edmondo Rossini; Vidkun Quisling in Norway; Otto Strasser in Germany and in England, Sir Oswald Mosley. Each came from the left of their respective labour movements, and all were implacably hostile to what they saw as the inertia of mainstream socialism, wedded as it was to working peacefully through the despised institutions of 'bourgeois democracy'. Despairing of a proletariat that had opted in the main for democracy and reforms rather than violent revolution against 'the system', they felt their way towards the ideology and methods of what we today describe as fascism as they shifted their focus from the organised workers 'movement to disaffected middle strata. Like their predecessors, the shock troops of the new campus totalitarianism are also disaffected, overwhelmingly middle class in composition, and putty in the hands of their manipulative academic mentors.

Among the most recent of these 'movements of feeling', in addition to the self-styled Social Justice Warriors who engulfed campuses across the USA and then the UK, we also had in the UK, those that coalesced around Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn, his elder brother Piers, and Brexit campaigner Nigel Farage. Their kinship with cultic religion revealed itself not only in leader worship and the elevation of feeling over reason and evidence (not least that of statistics, whose findings are spurned as if the work of the devil himself), and in the sanctification and demonization of 'identity', but also in their votaries' ritualist chanting in tongues and a ferocious 'groupthink' response to the slightest dissent from the cult's dogmas and theology. Each movement subscribed to a Manichean view of politics with usually a racist, gender, 'anti-establishment' or xenophobic dimension, and an unshakable conviction that it was the victim of a hydra-headed conspiracy. For the (Jeremy) Corbynistas, the Rothschilds and Israel loomed the largest in their demonology, and for his brother's 'lockdown rebels', the 'new world order', while with UKIP, it was Brussels, and the SJWs, combining race and gender, the white patriarchy. Common to all four was the belief, if not always clearly articulated, that behind the facade of what passes for democracy there operates a conspiracy either of race, faceless bureaucracy, 'big government', a 'deep state', 'the blob', or illicit wealth. But these characteristics, taken together, are also hall-marks of totalitarianism, not least the slander of and the ever-present threat of violence against doubters, heretics and unbelievers.

The totalitarian impulses of ‘Social Justice Warriors’ have been nourished and legitimised in academic institutions by the intellectual and moral chicanery of post-modernism and cultural relativism, which has penetrated to an alarming degree into the thinking of the western intelligentsia and those whose opinions are subject to its influences. For example, those who protested against the subjugation of women by Islam were reprimanded for their ‘cultural imperialism’ by western feminists who, while obsessed with a phantom ‘white patriarchy’, denounced as racist the least criticism of an all too real Muslim one. (See chapter 4 for examples) However, where Israel, the country so many on the left love to hate, is concerned, with regard to the methods it is compelled to use to defend itself from its many enemies, an exonerating ‘context’ no longer applies. Unlike those who seek its destruction, it is judged by conventional, universal standards, and invariably found wanting, not least by states who with impunity neither share nor uphold them. Far more than any other member state, Israel is incessantly accused at the United Nations, both at its General Assembly, and by subsidiary bodies such as its Human Rights Council, of human rights violations and even war crimes that are matters of routine among its accusers. (See Appendices G and II) But what is, on the face of it, strange, is that those in the west whose cultural relativism inhibits them from criticism of these same regimes, effortlessly shed their relativism when the Jews are in the frame. Israel is to be treated as a pariah state, indicted and found guilty by the United Nations on the grounds of violating the very same universal human rights and international laws which both the 57 members of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference and western cultural relativists regard as spurious. Such is the nature of the anti-Israel Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions campaign, endorsed by former Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn, that has no equivalent directed at any other state on this planet, no matter how abysmal its human rights record.

Consider this. The UK-based company Economist Intelligence Unit produces annually an index that measures the state of democracy, measured by 60 indicators, of 167 states. As of 2018, Israel was ranked 30. Below Israel were 12 member states of the European Union: Belgium (32) Czech Republic (34) Slovenia (36) Greece (38) Latvia (40) Slovakia (44) Bulgaria (47) Poland (53) Hungary (56) Croatia (58) and Romania (64). Then, way, way below, came states with which, as we shall see, Corbyn had a strong attachment or whose repressive domestic policies he had failed to criticise: Bolivia (98), Nicaragua (105), Palestine (108), Venezuela (117), Cuba (131), Russia (144), his former employer at Press TV, Iran (150), and just one place above bottom-ranked North Korea, Syria (166). Media freedom, as measured by Freedom House, placed Israel amongst a small group of nations totalling 13% of the world’s population where the media are free, while 45% of the world’s population lives under regimes where the opposite is the case, including what the report describes as ‘the world’s ten worst-rated countries’, among them (again) Cuba, Syria and Iran. Just to round out the picture of regimes where Corbyn had always been seen as a trusted ally and in some cases, welcome guest, Venezuela was included in a list of countries where ‘political or political unrest’ has been used as a ‘pretext for new crackdowns on independent or opposition-oriented outlets’.

As regards corruption, just as one would expect, the same picture emerges. The International Transparency Organisation ranked Israel at 28 out of 176 states, above EU members such as Poland on 29, and Spain on 41. Then came the usual suspects. Cuba was rated 60, Iran on 131, Russia 138, Nicaragua on 145, Bolivia 144, Venezuela on 166 and Syria fourth from the bottom, on 173. Confronted with

these facts and rankings, only the invincibly naïve can believe that the far left's unique and obsessive targeting of Israel has nothing to do with its being Jewish. The extent to which this double standard has influenced those who in matters unrelated to Israel are perfectly capable of rational debate was brought home to me when one particular exchange on this topic came to a premature close after I received an emailed ultimatum from a critic of my position on the Gaza conflict of 2014. Russia's chemical attacks on and bombing of Syria, illegal annexation of Crimea and occupation and then illegal annexation of the Ukrainian Donbas, unlike Israel's occupation of the West Bank, had elicited no condemnation from my critic. (But then what else was I to expect from someone who had been beguiled by the Corbyn cult, and had scornfully referred to the Jewish comedian Sacha Baron Chen as 'that Jew boy'?) The gist of the email was that my critic would not read an earlier draft of this book unless I first agreed to denounce a proposed new Jewish settlement in the West Bank. I had experienced at first hand the on-line version of 'no platforming'. I am, for the record, (see 'Afterthoughts', Volume 2) indeed opposed to any new Jewish settlements in the West Bank, and if it is necessary for a lasting peace with the Palestinians, the removal of existing ones, a policy that Israel enforced when it withdrew from the Gaza Strip in 2005, and in return, was subjected to repeated Hamas terror attacks. But it makes a mockery of political debate that, as a condition of the right to participate in one, it is necessary to agree in advance to propositions that are themselves the subject of the discussion. Had I accepted these absurd terms, what kind of discussion would it have been?

In my exchanges with leftist critics of Israel, a state that arouses their ire like no other, I have encountered what in fact is an almost universal assumption of those who identify themselves as left wing, that as such, they are, *ipso facto*, inoculated against all forms of racism, including anti-Semitism, and that therefore any views they may hold about Israel or Jews are necessarily free from its taint. Anyone who says otherwise runs the risk of being accused of trying to suppress legitimate criticism of Israel. The corrosive effects of such thinking have repercussions that go far beyond the politics of the Middle East, and originate, not necessarily in any conscious prejudice against the Jews, but certainly in a deeply-rooted western post-colonial guilt, which it is believed can only be purged by a remorseless indictment of and campaign against the misdeeds of modern western civilisation, especially those of the USA, and of course Israel as its Middle Eastern outpost. In its most extreme form, this mode of thinking feeds into what I call Sharia leftism, with its virulent anti-Zionism and, increasingly, as we shall see, quite open anti-Semitism masquerading as solidarity with the Palestinians. With Muslims the world over cast in the role of victim, the mantra of the hour for all infidels is, therefore, 'check your white imperialist privilege'. More generally, being told to 'check one's privilege' means that irrespective of whether they are or true or false, opinions on a certain subject can be rendered invalid if they are held by a person defined as male, heterosexual and white; thus, the politics of 'identity, in which not evidence and logic, but genes and sexual orientation are the criteria of truth. For example, men should on principle be excluded, and in fact have been, from any discussion about so-called 'women's issues', such as rape and abortion, yet Muslim men, being themselves supposedly victims of 'Islamophobia' and more generally, western imperialism, are, as we shall see, exempted from accusations of cruelties they might inflict on 'their' womenfolk. White men and women have been excluded from discussion about race issues, while white women, until recently

regarded as victims on account of their gender, have had this status vigorously challenged by women of darker hues. (See Appendix B) Yet Muslim women, whom, one might suppose, are triply entitled to qualify as victims on account of their non-western faith, the miseries and cruelties they suffer at the hands of their menfolk and, unless they are white converts, their ethnicity, are excluded from this category by western feminists and more generally the far left because otherwise, it would imply criticism of a victim religion, Islam, which sanctions their oppression. (See Chapter 3)

Evidently then, ‘checking your privilege’ can get rather complicated, as, for example in vitriolic exchanges between old-style feminists and transgender activists over the definition of a woman. For those belonging to a privileged category, in the first place, white heterosexual men, the only way to escape its opprobrium, even if only partially, is to very demonstratively identify with those who they have come to believe are their victims; for example, by claiming to be a woman and then demanding to be treated as such both socially and in law. This role reversal may well explain why a handful of Jews are amongst the most fervent supporters of Israel’s Jihadi enemies, why some white women in the USA have claimed they are in all but physical appearance, black and some men, women. Once a self-defining group succeeds in having itself accepted as being in some way lacking in ‘privilege’ (and, perverse as it may seem to the uninitiated, the competition for this status is getting hotter by the minute) then, in the name of social justice, or redressing perceived past wrongs, its members are then, as is the fashion now in academe, encouraged to advertise their own special, privileged ‘truths’, ‘truths’ that need, in fact must not be subject to rational investigation, so-called unique ‘ways of knowing’ derived from ‘lived experience’, ‘ways’ that however absurd, are challenged at the challenger’s peril. (See Appendix B) As a consequence of this new trend, an Orwellian thought police now stalks the campuses, an army of censorious ignoramuses whose mission, in the name of ‘inclusivity’, is to bring concord, redemption, unanimity and calm where there has been doubt, distress, pain, dissent, division and questioning, arbiters of what can and cannot be said, read and seen, of who can and cannot be heard. Anyone rash enough in such company to say what they believe, rather than what they believe they ought to say, is usually quick to discover that the dice is loaded against free debate even before the game starts. Those (like myself) who are assigned to one or more privileged categories can, in a discussion about a whole range of subjects, find themselves confronted by a set of arcane rules akin to positive discrimination, in which feeling and ‘identity’ are privileged over ‘white empiricism’ and logical thinking. (See Appendix B)

Thus, we have an LGBT truth or truths, a (preferably non white) female truth, a (male) Muslim truth, a black truth, a fat truth (yes, it exists...see Footnote to Appendix B), an anti-imperialist truth, a disabled truth, all being collectively defined, perhaps in acknowledgement of its undoubted epistemological kinship with post-modernism, as ‘post truths’, that is, ‘truths’ arrived by routes other than those pursued by conventional disciplines, which supposedly serve merely to propagate ‘establishment truths’ that justify and uphold the power and wealth of the white, heterosexual patriarchy. In its function of subverting the meanings of words for dubious political ends, ‘post truth’ is analogous to the ‘Newspeak’ of 1984 and the phenomenon of what goes by the name of ‘fake news’. Its integral scepticism towards what are proven facts and truths also generates a most fertile culture for the

breeding, and via social media, the dissemination of all manner of conspiracy theories, many of them implicitly or overtly anti-Semitic. In just one of many instances of the *soi-disant* left finding itself in company with the right, 'Special Councillor' Kellayenne Conway announced to Trump's first Presidential press conference that in rebutting claims that the numbers attending his inauguration ceremony had been greatly exaggerated by the new President, White House Press Officer Sean Spicer, had provided 'alterative (sic) facts'. We shall revisit this parallel epistemological universe when we explore the deleterious impact of holocaust-denying Muslim migrants on the leftist-dominated Swedish education system. (See Appendix C)

The growing concern by the politically correct to avoid being in any way identified as privileged (largely because, as a study in the USA has demonstrated, they almost invariably are by virtue of their education and economic and social status) has led to a peculiar mutation in the meaning ascribed to the word 'humble'. Beginning with a 'humbled' Queen Elizabeth II, when she thanked her loyal subjects for celebrating one of her several anniversaries, it became the fashion for those who, in various ways, can legitimately be described as privileged by virtue of their status, to say they have been 'humbled' when their standing is rewarded or recognised in some way. Politicians are 'humbled' when elected by voters, film stars by the award of Oscars, athletes by winning gold medals, royalty by sheer accident of birth. What they surely must think is, by receiving recognition of some kind, they feel proud, honoured or privileged. But they never say it. Indeed, they dare not. This *de rigueur* phoney self-abasement has trickled down to the most mundane levels. A headline to a sports story in my local paper ran thus: 'Humbled to get Honour'...a textbook example of a non-sequitur. Surely, he meant 'proud'. Then why not say so? But if not, then refuse it. Who in their right mind allows themselves to be publicly humiliated and degraded, because that is how my dictionary, *Chambers*, and I am sure all others no less reputable, defines 'to humble' and its cognates, namely, to 'lower, abase, mortify, degrade, humiliate, injure the self-respect of', and more in the same vein. The *Koran* follows this correct usage when it demands that Muslims fight 'those who have given the book [i.e., Jews and Christians] until they pay the tribute out of hand and have been humbled'. (9; 29)

To give another example. As we all know, the roll of the political dice can sometimes play unexpected tricks. On the day of the 2016 US Presidential elections, convinced by pollsters and her own sense of entitlement that victory was in the bag, Hilary Clinton, deploying the now-fashionable PC semantics, announced to the world how she had been 'humbled' by those whom she assumed were voting her into the White House. Hours later, a tearful Clinton had discovered she had not only been guilty of hubris but had been truly humbled by the no less privileged and anything but humble Donald Trump. The word humble has acquired its novel currency because in this age of *faux* egalitarianism, to be branded privileged is to be avoided at all costs, otherwise, what one has to say, irrespective of its intrinsic worth, will be rendered spurious by its tainted origins. So, the greater the privilege, the more the need to avow the opposite, starting with the most privileged of all, a queen and she who would be President of the USA. Yet there was a time when to humble or be humbled meant just that. Letters were signed. 'Your most humble and obedient servant.' Subjects of the sovereign did not humble their sovereign but were themselves required to be humble. Did the Queen really feel 'mortified', 'humiliated', and 'degraded' when flag-waving crowds dutifully assembled outside

one of her five palaces to celebrate her 60th year as Head of State, Commonwealth, Church of England and Armed Forces, each as her inheritance by birth alone as Britannic Majesty of Great Britain and Northern Ireland? As the saying has it, 'humility is the worst form of conceit.'

When the meaning of words, whose origin and purpose is the denoting and description of reality, is subverted and even, as in this instance, inverted, much else can follow, as for example the consequences of the new meaning invested in the word 'respect'. Again, resorting to my dictionary, I find that 'respect' means 'to treat with consideration', 'to feel or show esteem, deference or honour to' etc etc. This word now has acquired a special function when used by the politically correct, where it has been employed not only to uphold respect for a person's *right* to believe in, practice and promote a religion, which is as it should be, but to demand 'respect' for a person's *actual* religious beliefs and, pursuant to that, to insist on measures to prevent a religion (always Islam) being criticised in a 'disrespectful', or 'offensive' manner. Here, in this usage, showing 'respect', for example, as demanded by Jeremy Corbyn for Islam at a Muslim pro-censorship rally in Trafalgar Square on February 12, 2006, requires that non-believers 'feel or show esteem, deference or honour' to a number of practices sanctioned by Islam that are not only morally repugnant to any civilised person, but also happen to be crimes under UK law, even if in some cases they are rarely, if ever, punished as such. This usage of 'respect' can and in fact does perversely lead in its turn, not to a respect for the right to criticise those beliefs, beliefs moreover that can and do contribute to the committing of criminal acts, such as wife-beating and female genital mutilation, but to its opposite, statutory limitations on what can be said about those beliefs. (Needless to say, secular beliefs are afforded no such protection.) The result is the privileging (sic) of religious belief over criticism of religious belief, and its enshrinement in so-called 'hate speech' criminal laws.

The inversion of word meanings and the denial and subversion of objective truth are practises which George Orwell explored in both *Animal Farm* and *1984*, with its Ministry of Truth that told nothing but lies and, like Islam, one of Peace that waged constant wars of conquest. He was the first to grasp, and moreover illustrate brilliantly, how, to further their bid to control human thought, totalitarian regimes invested words with totally inverted meanings...Stalin's puppet 'People's Democracies', Pol Pot's Democratic Kampuchea, Kim Jong-un's Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a 'peace campaigner' who described Jew-killing terrorists as 'friends' dedicated to 'long-term peace', a 'Stop the War Coalition' that refuses to condemn the chemical bombing of civilians, a 'religion of peace' that wages holy war, and a 'social justice' that discriminates on the basis of skin colour, sexuality and gender.

As for those who refuse to play by the rules of newspeak, the word police are on the march in the west, targeting institutions and constitutions that were once the preserve and bastions of free thought. To take one case. In New York since May 2016, it has been the law that gender has nothing to do with biology and genes, but is, as the post-modernists tell us, a purely 'social construct', to the extent that not only can one choose at will one one's gender, irrespective one's genes, DNA and hormones, but that that choice must be recognised in law, and consequently, that it can be an offence not to use 'pronouns of choice' favoured by transgenders of various kinds and those classifying themselves as 'gender-fluid'. (As with the US anti-racist industry, 'transitioning' has proved to be a profitable business. with a

turnover in 2022 of \$ 2 billion.) At the latest count, these pronouns numbered 58, while 31 gender identities are covered by the ruling. Use the wrong pronoun or title, and one could end up paying a fine of up to \$250,000. This madhouse version of newspeak became incumbent on employers, landlords and professionals in their dealings with respectively their employees, tenants and clients, following a ruling by the New York City Commission of Human Rights. As is the way with such laws, it is only a matter of time before the usage is imposed on all and sundry, as indeed it has been in ultra 'progressive' - and by the same token, no less repressive - Canada. I would submit that compelled speech violates the right of free speech and as such, is a *prima facie* breach of the First Amendment of the US Constitution. On such manna did Trumpism feed.

In politically super-correct Canada, where there are no such constitutional guarantees, the House of Commons-approved Bill C16 took New York's imposition of gender newspeak several steps further down the road to 1984. Based on laws already in force in Ontario, Canada's politically correct power-house, the proposed legislation was approved by the Upper House, defining and criminalising 'misgendering' as 'hate speech'. Even using the word 'biology' in certain contexts can come under this heading, because on February 27, 2013, the Canadian Supreme Court ruled that if they give offence, 'not all truthful statements must be free from restriction'. In other words, saying what is true can be a crime. As we shall see, this is not only the case in Canada.

Having given up on a (mainly white and male) working class as irredeemably politically incorrect, in its search for a new constituency, the totalitarian left, the main driving force behind the Newspeak onslaught, has simultaneously trimmed its sails to two totally incompatible movements, pandering to every whim and sexual fad of over-privileged and under-educated western women and non 'sis' sexuals, while aligning itself with regimes and movements that sanction the genital mutilation of female babies, child marriages, the beating and raping of wives, the stoning to death of adulteresses, the sexual enslavement of infidel women, and the murder of homosexuals. But then did not Stalin have his pact with Hitler?

Genderist lunacy is not confined to North America. UK schools have been advised not to refer to their charges as boys and girls, while the British Medical Association has recommended that maternity staff stop using the term 'expectant mothers' least it gives offence to 'intersex or trans people'. Instead, all *homo sapiens* carrying a foetus should be called 'pregnant people', while hospitals ask men if they are pregnant before being subject to a body scan. In deference to men who claim to be women, breast feeding has become 'chest feeding. There remains the question: has the BMA made itself a hostage to fortune? How can it be sure that even to be classified as a genderless 'person' might in the not-too-distant future give offence to those who want to be defined and treated as 'species fluid'? And while we are at it, why not a transgender lesbian unicorn? (Why not indeed? In the summer of 2023, fee paying schools in the UK were subjected to a surge of trans-speciesism, with girls claiming to be and yes, treated by staff as, cats, and in one case, as a horse, which was taken out to the school playing field for a daily gallop.) As was only to be expected, genderists seized the opportunity to hijack the women's Washington anti-Trump march, whose official purpose was to protest against the President's misogyny. Instead, in one photo, while none of the many posters in view attacked Trump by name, one marcher put biology firmly in its woke place with a poster proclaiming the post truth that 'Gender is a Social Construct'. Another out-

Trumped the President's obscenities by prominently displaying the word 'cunt', while a third called upon 'Nasty Women' to 'Unite'.

The self-promoting, self-indulgent farce of genderism and male-baiting attacks on a non-existent 'white patriarchy' was transparently motivated not by a desire for 'social justice', for how can anti-white racism and misandry be described as such, but a stratagem to escape the opprobrium of being designated as socially privileged, which is exactly what these exponents of gender and race politics invariably were. With what is best defined as a simulated, self-defining multi-gender victimhood, the perpetrators of the fraud are exploiting the fact that a tiny minority are genuinely 'transgender' in one way or another by concocting and claiming to belong to one or more of an exponentially expanding number of fictitious sexual categories (as of 2022, the BBC counted 150), accompanied by the devising of an Orwellian quackspeak vocabulary to accommodate them, whose use then becomes legally enforceable. This is crazy enough. What truly beggars belief is not only the readiness of public institutions and legislators to afford this patent racket a legal status, but that both leftist exponents and rightist critics of this unseemly charade assert that its sources of inspiration are the teachings of Karl Marx, freshly packaged as an anti-Western 'cultural Marxism'.

It is evident from these symmetrical claims that neither faction is acquainted with the classic statement of the theory of history adumbrated by Marx and Engels in their *Manifesto of the Communist Party* of 1848. The first sentence of this work boldly asserts, not, as one might suppose, that 'the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of gender, race, and sexual struggles', or of any other that today is being waged on campuses in the USA and now throughout the Anglo-Saxon world, but, 'the history of *class struggle*' (Emphasis added), class being defined by its role in the given system of production. The last sentence of the same work ends, not with the call for 'women, gays, transgenders, non-whites, Muslims etc of all campuses' to unite, (a coalition that goes by the name of 'intersectionality') but for 'working men [the proletarian wing of the patriarchy] of all countries [to] unite', to establish an order of things in which 'the free development of each individual is the condition for the free development of all'...the negation of totalitarian campus herdism. For the self-styled partisans of 'social justice', disparities of wealth and income are only an issue when they are said to exist between men and women (the so-called gender pay gap) or races, not between classes or, for that matter, between women or between members of the same non-white ethnic group, while white men who collect the garbage, unblock the sewers and rescue women from burning buildings are deemed oppressors.

So however its activists and conservative opponents might define it, what we have here is not a left movement, even less a Marxist one, in any traditional sense of the term, but a power and privilege-hungry alliance of the gilded youth of elite universities, one that for all its posturing as victims, is comprised of the most privileged generation in human history. For example, the only beef most feminists have with capitalism is that because of the so-called boardroom 'glass ceiling', not enough (overwhelmingly white) upper middle-class women are getting in on the action, or if they are, not getting a big enough slice of it. However, there are no objections to the undeniable prevalence of a similar 'white patriarchy' in the substantially less remunerative and glamorous higher echelons of trade unions. Then there is so-called 'affirmative action' (no longer 'positive discrimination', which smacks too much of Jim Crow) where the criteria of race and gender instead

of merit hopefully provide an *entrée* into the ranks of the bourgeoisie. When these snow flakers finally emerge triumphantly from what were once places of unfettered learning only to discover that their prized but worthless degrees in race, fat, women's and gender studies equip them neither to cope with the inevitable vicissitudes of life beyond the campus, or to secure the employment they believe they are entitled to, be sure that this will once again be blamed on the machinations of an invisible but all-pervading white patriarchy.

The truth is that far from being victims, Social Justice Warriors are in reality privileged, upwardly mobile totalitarians in the making, waging in the name of an ethnic, sexual and gender 'diversity' a sometimes-violent war for conformity and uniformity of belief. The right to free expression is being buried beneath an avalanche of spurious victimhoods, hate speech laws and rights not to be offended, whether they are those of 31 varieties of cross and fluid genderists or Muslims who demand and are granted laws which ensure their religion must always be described by those who do not believe in it as one of peace, love and tolerance. In these movements, double standards are rife. We shall see that there are some self-styled feminists who ignore, deny and yes, even celebrate the vile treatment of their sisters in the Islamic world. And this does not only apply to *dhimmi* feminists. US-Palestinian celebrity Muslim Linda Sarsour surely went beyond her remit as one of the organisers of the women's Washington anti-Trump protest when she tweeted 'You'll know when you're living under Sharia law if suddenly all your loans and credit cards become interest-free. Sounds nice, doesn't it?' Not so nice was her tweet that she would like to 'take the vagina away' from Ayaan Hirsi Ali, an ex-Muslim atheist, herself a victim of and campaigner against female genital mutilation. And there are hundreds of millions of Muslim women who, unlike Brooklyn-based Ms. Sarsour (who, incidentally, claimed that being a Palestinian made her black and, like Arafat, that Jesus was a Palestinian) are living under a system of law that treats them as inferior to men, and could tell her that it is not so nice to be ruled by a man who can beat and rape his wife or wives with impunity and treat them as domestic beasts of burden. Sarsour, who in 2015 shared a platform with the notoriously ant-Semitic Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan ('don't forget when God puts you [i.e., the Jews] in the gas ovens it's forever') was also an admirer of fellow anti-Zionist Corbyn, with her tweet 'come and be our President pleasssssseeeeeee.'

If we look more closely at the issue of privilege and victimhood, not all is as it seems or is claimed to be. Middle class male Muslim students who enjoy all the facilities of a western university education are safe in the knowledge that they will not be required to 'check their privilege' by politically correct college authorities and student unions, and so consequently will feel free to give vent on campus to Nazi-style loathing of the Jews and contempt for women. In one of many such incidents, on January 19, 2016, a mob of Muslim student thugs from the London School of African and Oriental Studies, all members of Action Palestine (sic) launched a violent attack on a meeting of Kings College's Israel Society. My son, a Professor at Kings, happened to be in his office next door to the room where the meeting was due to be held, and witnessed what took place. (There were also reports of this outrage in the press) To chants of 'two, four, six eight, Israel is a fascist state [sic!]' and 'free speech [sic!!!]', chairs were broken, windows smashed and fire alarms set off, the level of violence being such that nearby offices, including my son's, had to be evacuated, and as many as 20 police officers called to the scene to

restore some sort of order. The attack, however, succeeded in its main objective, which was to deny free speech to Jews by having the meeting abandoned. Neither were there any arrests. 'Check your privilege'?

Kings College is one of a majority, some 90%, of the UK's institutions of higher (sic) learning where 'trigger warnings' and a 'safe space' policy protect 'snowflake' students' delicate brains from encountering opinions, ideas, outside speakers, publications and even core topics on the syllabus that they could find distressing or threatening. Kings College was not alone in being unable to ensure a physically safe space for its Jewish students to conduct a meeting. The anti-Semitism rife on campuses, and nowhere more so than amongst genuinely over-privileged upper class Corbynista Jew-baiters at Oxford, where little if any attempt was made to pass it off as anti-Zionism (See Chapter 19) can be largely explained by the coming together of a growing number of pro-Jihadi Muslim students with an increasingly Sharia dominated left.

This convergence is one aspect of the rise of a more general anti-Semitism in British society, even in such a well-respected organisation as Amnesty International. At its 2016 Annual Conference, as usual, a number of resolutions were moved for approval by delegates. Unusually, one was not passed. Defeated, by 468 votes to 461, it requested that Amnesty International conduct a campaign against the increase of anti-Semitism in the UK. Yet in 2012, Amnesty had devoted considerable resources to just such a campaign against anti-Muslim prejudice. Why one, and not the other? Could it be that since a substantial contribution to this upsurge was being made by Muslims, a comprehensive campaign against anti-Semitism would necessarily have had to confront the issue of Muslim attitudes towards the Jews, and therefore possibly invite accusations of Islamophobia? It is not as if evidence is lacking for the rapid growth of anti-Jewish prejudice in the UK. From a low of 532 anti-Semitic incidents reported in 2004, the number by 2014 had risen to 1,168. This number doubled again in 2015. Could it also be that within Amnesty, there are those who, to cite just two of many examples, like the controlling anti-Zionist faction in Oxford University's Labour Club and the (socialist) Mayor of Malmo, believe that Jews who refuse to renounce their support for Israel deserve what is coming to them? So it might seem, because in 2022, Amnesty marketed a range of T shirts carrying their own logo, and in huge print, END ISRAELI APARTHEID, together with a 'briefing document' titled, *Israel's apartheid against Palestinians: A crime against humanity*.

The global reaction to recent conflicts between Israel and those Muslim states and movements who seek its destruction established beyond any doubt that millions of the politically active and also those less so, whether on the extreme right or left, as well as many in between, reserve for Israel and its Jewish inhabitants a hostility they feel for no other country or people on this planet. In the present escalating confrontation between Israel, with a Jewish population of seven million, and world Islam, with its nearly two billion, and despite Iran's pledge that it will 'wipe Israel off the map', in the estimation of many, probably a majority, of those that concern themselves with the conflict, the Jewish state is the guilty party. The vast majority of the world's Muslims, and especially those in the Middle East, not only share this judgment, but invest it with a hatred for Jews they have imbibed, as we shall see, from the earliest years of their childhood. Fueled in their later years by a religion that refers to Jews as the offspring of 'apes and swine', fit only for slaughter by the armies of Allah, it is a hatred so deeply imbedded in their

consciousness that for many, no amount of rational argument will dislodge it. The result is millions of Arab Muslims truly believing, as the Hamas Covenant says, that the Jews, who number 0.2 of humanity, are pursuing not only the goal of exterminating the Palestinians, but of ruling the world. Yet far from challenging these hatreds and fantasies, a part of the left has exploited and even endorsed them, since they coincide with its own anti-Zionist, anti-Western agenda. This indulgence of anti-Semitic terrorism culminated in the demonstrations that erupted on the streets of Europe during the Gaza conflicts of 2014 and 2023-4, accompanied in the former with not only chants of 'We are all Hamas', but 'Hamas, Hamas, Jews to the Gas' and assaults on synagogues and Jewish shops. These scenes were re-enacted four years later, when in France far left and right Yellow Vest activists marched together displaying and chanting slogans such as 'Macron is a whore of the Jews' and 'The Jews are pulling the strings'. The Jewish philosopher Alain Finkelkraut was surrounded and verbally abused with chants of 'dirty Zionist' and 'we are in France', where Jews obviously did not belong. As with its Corbynista counterpart in the UK, conspiracy theories ran rife in the 'Yellow Vest' movement, with nearly half of its activists subscribing to a belief in a 'planetary Zionist plot'.

At the time of the 2014 Gaza conflict, there was a mobilisation on the streets of London identical to that in France and Germany, comprised of the same ad hoc alliance of Muslims, leftists and far right anti-Semites, save for what would prove to be one significant difference. Marching at their head was a veteran anti-Israel campaigner of more than three decades who a year later would be elected Leader of one of the UK's two major political parties. Some five years previously, while still an obscure back-bencher, he had addressed, as one its founders and patrons, a meeting of the Stop the War Coalition, where he had spoken warmly of those he called his 'friends'. These 'friends' were the anti-Semitic, genocidal movements Hamas and Hezbollah. In particular, Corbyn praised Hamas, banned throughout the Western world as a terrorist organisation, for being 'dedicated towards bringing about long-term peace and social justice'. In due course, we will have a closer look at this movement, one which, very far from being as Corbyn describes it, is, as its founding Covenant of 1988 specifically states, dedicated not only to the destruction of Israel, but a *world-wide extermination of the Jews*. Yet it is the Jews of Israel who are accused of genocide.

In addition to hosting meetings at Westminster and elsewhere with representatives of Palestinian terrorist movements, in November 2010, Corbyn, accompanied by Labour MP Andrew Slaughter and *Guardian* journalist (and later Corbyn's 'Director of Communications') Seumas Milne, travelled to Jerusalem and the West Bank to confer with leading Hamas officials, a trip that contrary to rule, he failed to declare in the MPs Register of Financial Interests. Readers can view online if they so wish Corbyn, together with the aptly-named Labour MP Andrew Slaughter, relaxing in the company of three top Hamas officials; Ahmad Attoun, billionaire Khaled abu-Arafah and Muhammed Toha. In the five years between September 2000 and August 2005, Corbyn's 'friends', in their pursuit of what he described as 'long-term peace', murdered 325 Israeli civilians and wounded 1,026. Among those killed were 33 children under the age of 16.

In 2012, Corbyn acted as chairman of a meeting in Doha, ingenuously described as a 'Seminar on Palestinian Refugees in the Arab World'. Amongst those participating were again, senior officials of Hamas, among them Khaled Meshal, Abdu Aziz Umar and Husan Badran. Badran, one of a number of Hamas terrorists

released by Israel in exchange for a kidnapped Israeli soldier, Gilad Shalita. Badran was personally involved in the planning and execution of terrorist attacks which killed more than a hundred Israeli civilians. A video of the proceedings shows Corbyn presiding in the chair at a meeting in which, in the course of his address, Jew-killer Badran declared that ‘the return [that, is to Israel] will only be viable through military and armed resistance [sic] and nothing else.’ Commenting on the ‘Seminar’, peace campaigner Corbyn found mass murderer Badran’s speech ‘fascinating and electrifying’. Two years on, in September 2014, Corbyn was in Tunisia to attend yet another Islamic terrorist conference, where once again, he can be seen on the platform. On this occasion the key note speech was delivered by top Hamas commander and Jewish conspiracy theorist Sultan Raed Salah, who outlined his ‘four-point vision for the fight against Israel’. Corbyn described the event, one that in reality was a council of war, as a ‘peace conference’. We will meet Raed Salah again, not in Tunisia, but London, as an honoured guest of peace campaigner Corbyn. (For a fuller account of the Tunisia event, see Appendix V)

These assassins of Jews were the people Corbyn regarded as an ‘honour and ‘pleasure’ to have as his ‘friends’, and as allies in the struggle against Zionism. They demonstrated their own kind of pleasure and honour when on June 8, 2016, two Hamas terrorists celebrated the beginning of Ramadan by shooting dead four Jewish shoppers and wounding eleven more in an attack on the Sarona market in Tel Aviv, the city that the previous Friday, had celebrated Israel’s open, secular and tolerant culture with a 200,000-strong annual Gay Pride march. In a statement released after the murders, Corbyn’s ‘friends’ praised the massacre as ‘heroic’. The operation, ‘the first of many surprises’, was a ‘message from children of the resistance to leaders of the occupation’. The ‘moderate’ Fatah, headed by Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas who, officially at least, was opposed to terrorism and committed to the so-called two state solution of the ‘Palestine question’, claimed Israel was ‘reaping the repercussions of choosing violence against the Palestinian people’. Just like the victims of 9/11, the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre and countless other similar Muslim atrocities, ‘they had it coming’.

It will be objected by those who justify Corbyn’s choice of ‘friends’ that Israel’s enemies have been fighting a just war of liberation, not of conquest and elimination, and what others see might as war crimes must be judged in this ‘context’. Let us put to one side those recent Jihadist movements of which this is patently not the case, in the first place Islamic Jihad, Hamas and Hezbollah, because they have declared in their founding charters and public statements that their goal is not peace with Israel, but its elimination. Instead let us go back to 1964, the year the PLO, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation, was founded. If we exclude Israel as it was then, with no ‘occupied territories’ and entirely within its original borders of 1948, the only Palestinian ‘occupied territories’ that needed to be ‘liberated’ were under Arab rule, namely, what is now the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Since the 1948 war against Israel both had being illegally annexed by Jordan and occupied by Egypt respectively, each being territories that had been allotted by the UN as the basis for an independent Palestinian state situated between Israel to the west and Jordan to the east. The movements which in recent decades have distinguished themselves by their obsessive campaigning against Israel never, prior to the June War of 1967, displayed a comparable concern for the fate of those Palestinians denied statehood and political rights by the illegal occupation of their territories by

their supposed Arab brothers. The entire focus was, and remains, on Israel, even though Palestinians then comprised no more than 10% of its population, unlike in East Bank Jordan, where today they comprise around half of its population of 11 million.

Just as it does today, the far left simply rubber-stamped the strategy, policies and methods of those who claimed to represent the best interest of the Palestinian people. In accordance with both Nasserite and Ba'athist versions of Arab nationalism, instead of insisting on the right to self-government of the vast majority of Palestinians under Arab rule, all the PLO's 'liberationist' activities were directed exclusively against a state, Israel, with an overwhelmingly Jewish population, one which, for reasons that should not need stating, had no desire to be 'liberated' by anti-Semitic Arab terrorists. Furthermore, the term 'liberation' could not be applied since 2005 to the Gaza Strip, because after being occupied by Israel following the June War of 1967, in that year, Israel unilaterally totally withdrew from the territory, which had previously been illegally occupied since 1949 by Egypt without any protests by any Palestinian leaders or their international sympathisers. As for the West Bank, since June 1967, it had been first under Israeli administration, and then, following the Oslo Accords agreement of 1993 between Israel and the PLO on a 'two state solution' to the Palestinian issue, from 1994 under the rule of the Palestinian Authority headed by Fatah, with the exception of joint PA-Israeli responsibility for internal security. This arrangement was pending a final agreement between the Palestinian leadership and Israel for the establishment of a fully sovereign Palestinian state. These easily ascertainable facts are either unknown to anti-Zionist campaigners, or if they are known, simply do not count any more than do refutations of the fables concocted by medieval Christians and modern Muslims about Jewish well-poisoners and child murderers. That there is a 'Palestine issue' is seen exclusively as the fault of Israel, and the reason why, for all the Palestinian factions' mutual hatreds and rivalries, just as it was prior to the June War of 1967, the goal has remained the same; a 'liberation' of the Palestinians that entails the destruction of the 'Zionist entity'. And unlike Fatah, Corbyn's Jihadi 'friends' make no attempt to disguise it.

The unabating and all-consuming hostility of much of the left towards Israel and what it defines as 'western imperialism' has led to an uncritical acceptance of some of the worst abuses practised by followers of Islam. The US atheist comedian Bill Mayer captured the hypocrisy of his fellow leftists' double standards in this respect with a little anecdote. When a Saudi swordsman publicly beheads a convicted Muslim homosexual in Mecca, the home of Islam, liberals and leftists (and one can add gay rights campaigners) with few exceptions are silent. Given that Mecca, quipped Mayer, is the Muslim equivalent of the Vatican, imagine the outcry from the same politically correct liberals and leftists if the Pope ordered the public beheading of gay Catholics in the Vatican City. Not only is there silence. Laws have been devised to enforce it. Unlike in the USA, where free speech is, if increasingly precariously, protected by the First Amendment, as we shall see, in the UK and on the Continent, anyone who today publicly criticises Islam in ways that it deserves runs the risk of prosecution under a battery of so-called 'hate speech' laws. Neither is the press free to express an opinion concerning Islam, as the on-line *Daily Mail* discovered when it ran a story with the headline: 'Mother of four stabbed to death while at family funeral "may have been murdered in Islamic honour killing"'.

In response to a complaint by the Muslim Council of Britain, IPSO, the Independent Press Standards Organisation, demanded that the *Mail* publish a retraction to the effect that Islam did not sanction so-called ‘honour killings’. Either the Council was mistaken or lying, because it does. Chapter 18 of the *Koran* tells of an encounter between Moses and ‘a servant of Ours’, none other than the prophet himself. In due course, they come across a ‘young boy’, who Mohammed for no obvious reason promptly kills (Verse 75). Moses then exclaims, ‘hast thou slain an innocent person without his having slain anyone?’. At first, his slayer offers no explanation for the deed, but then does so as he takes his leave of Moses: ‘And as for the youth, his parents were believers and we feared lest on growing up he should involve them into trouble through rebellion and disbelief. So, we desired that their Lord should give them in exchange one better than he in purity and closer in filial affection.’ (Verses 81-82) The *Mail* was obviously unaware that its article stood on firm theological ground, because the *Koran* clearly states that the deeds of the prophet serve as a model for all Muslims, as in Chapter 33 Verse 21: ‘There has certainly been for you in the Messenger of Allah an excellent pattern for anyone whose hope is in Allah and the Last Day and who remembers Allah often.’ So the *Mail* proposed a statement which read: ‘We are happy to make clear Islam as a religion does not support honour killings’. One would have thought that the *Mail*’s unwarranted apology would have given satisfaction to the Muslim Council of Britain. But far from it. Miqdaad Versi, the Council’s Assistant Secretary General, now demanded his full pound of flesh. He rejected the statement proposed by the *Mail* and instead requested that IPSO make a formal ruling on the matter which contained and by implication at least, endorsed his (unfounded) objections. (We shall see that ‘honour killing’ is not only sanctioned by the *Koran*, but by the supposedly moderate Palestinian Authority when the victim is a wife. See Chapter 17) This case was a dangerous precedent. Previously, IPSO had not arbitrated in matters of theology. Its role had been to ensure accurate reporting and the protection of individuals from unwarranted invasions of privacy, not the protection of religions from alleged misrepresentations. IPSO in fact stated on its website that one of its objectives was to ‘maintain freedom of expression for the press’, not its policing by religious zealots.

Press regulations aside, the gags on free expression imposed by so-called ‘hate speech’ laws are so framed that they can be invoked to punish those making statements about Islam that are true, even though their target is an idea and not a person or persons, as in cases of alleged libel or deformation. Worse still, the purpose, as the wording of the various acts makes clear, is also to penalise saying, writing, drawing or in any other way doing something that *could* give offence, for example, fixing a sticker describing Halal slaughter as ‘barbaric’ on a chicken in a supermarket that resulted in a conviction for ‘racially aggravated criminal damage’. (Yes, this really happened, as we shall in Chapter 26) If I were to make a public statement to the effect that the year of Mohammed’s death as given in Muslim accounts of his life (632 AD) is incorrect, I would be as certain as one could be that I would not be the target of death threats, or that Muslim scholars and clerics would take great offence, or demand that that I should be prosecuted under hate speech laws, even though they believed the statement to be untrue. But what if I were to publish (as with this work I have done) or say something in public about the prophet that was demonstrably correct, and could be proved to be such in a court of law by reference to impeccably orthodox Islamic sources universally accepted

by Muslims as true? For example, what would be my chances of not being prosecuted for hate speech under Article Five of the Public Order Act of 1988, as amended and extended in its scope by the Racial and Religious Hatred Act of 2006, if I was heard by someone, *who does not have to be a Muslim*, to say in public, or to publish, as I do here, the following:

Given that the accounts of the prophet's consummation of his marriage with his last wife Aisha when she was nine years old are true, as recorded in Muslim sources Bukhari, Volume 5, Book 58, 234; Sahih Muslim, Book 008, Number 3309-311; Sunan Abu Dawud, Number 2116, etc, then under English law as it stands today, if he were to repeat this act in England with a girl of the same age and was then apprehended, brought to trial in an English court, and found guilty of having sexual relations with a child under the age 13, (Sexual Offences Act of 2003, Part 1, Section 8), Allah's messenger would be sentenced to a lengthy jail term and, as a convicted paedophile, be entered onto the sex-offenders register for life.

Unlike the first statement concerning the prophet's birthday, this one is true, but nevertheless saying or publishing it could, depending on the circumstances or, if you will 'context', land me in a court of law facing charges of hate speech that carry a prison sentence of up to seven years. This is not so improbable as it sounds. In 2011, an Austrian court convicted former diplomat and teacher Elisabeth Sabaditsch of 'denigrating religious beliefs of a legally recognised religion' for simply repeating, as I have just done in the above, what all Islamic sources affirm about the age of Aisha at the time of the consummation of her marriage to Mohammed. Even more outrageous and, given that it could create a precedent for identical rulings in future similar cases, no less sinister, was that this conviction was upheld by the European Court of Human Rights, one of which, so it would seem, does not include the right to say irrefutable truths about Islam. While Muslims can say what she said with impunity, since it is about their religion, Austrian *kuffar*, it seems, can only do so at the risk of, in this case, either a fine or 60 days in prison. As the reader will learn in due course, prosecutions have been brought in the UK for far milder statements than this, and saying what is true is no defence in such cases. In mine, I could, if only hypothetically, have given offence to a Muslim or Muslims for saying something that they would, if they were honest, agree was true, and yet I could still be found guilty as charged and quite possibly find myself in jail beginning a lengthy sentence, not for insulting or lying about Islam, but for telling the truth. And indeed, again in Austria, this has already happened. In 2009, the politician Susanne Winter was convicted of 'anti-Muslim incitement' for saying that 'in today's [legal] system, the Prophet Mohammed would be considered a child molester'. The reader may well be thinking...how can it be a criminal offence to say something that is incontestably true, as in this instance, or to quote from or comment on a text? Indeed. But again, as the reader will learn in due course in more detail, proposals to do just this have been made at the United Nations and in Canada. In both cases, the intention had been to frame laws that would criminalise quoting from or simply *referring* to the *Koran* by non-Muslims. In an analogous hypothetical case, I have often speculated on what might happen to me if I stood outside my local (men only) mosque with a placard which simply said: 'Female Genital Mutilation is a Crime. Report it to the Police'. The odds are that the crime reported to the police would have been committed by me and, quite possibly,

reported by someone who approves of FGM. Imagine, if you can, criminal charges of hate speech being brought in the UK against a historian for saying or writing that Pol Pot, Mao, Hitler and Stalin should be ranked with Tamburlaine and Genghis Khan as among the greatest mass murderers in human history, on the grounds that this judgement had offended admirers of the four modern dictators. Or on a more personal level, a doctor telling a patient who weighs thirty stone that they are obese. This statement is, like the first, also true, and very likely to offend. In fact, you could say the fatter the person and therefore the truer the statement, the more offence is likely to be taken. Few people like to be reminded of what they inwardly know to be their own shortcomings. However, a doctor saying that a person is fat will probably not, as the law stands, result in criminal charges of fatophobia. (However, you can never be quite sure. A student demonstrator was arrested for saying that a police horse was gay, and college students can now get a degree in 'Fat Studies'.) Telling a Muslim that his religion could have been founded by a paedophile is also a true statement, based on information derived exclusively from Muslim sources. It too will not only certainly offend, but unlike the previous two hypothetical cases, if published or said in public, could quite easily lead to criminal charges. (In Austria, it did) Why this difference, when in each case, all that has occurred is that offence has been allegedly taken of a statement that is manifestly true? So is the law saying that some offences (allegedly) taken are more so than others, and those that are, are the result of criminal acts? Yes, it is.

The brain child of high-tide Thatcherite authoritarianism, but now seen by much of the left and Muslim pressure groups as a bulwark against 'Islamophobia', Section Five of the Public Order Act of 1986 made it an offence to convey either by 'words or behaviour' or 'writing, sign or other visible representation' anything 'which is threatening, abusive or insulting' within the sight or hearing of a person 'likely to be caused harassment, harm or distress thereby'. Not, 'has been proven to have caused', but 'likely to', a stipulation that does not even require that anyone has actually been affected in the ways indicated. All that is required is that a single witness is prepared to testify in court that they have heard or seen offensive words or images of a nature they consider to be covered by the terms of the Act, and considered them likely to be offensive, not necessarily to themselves, but one or more other persons present; for example, one or more persons presumed to be Muslims. That, and that alone, could be enough to lead to charges under the Act, and possibly to a conviction. In fact, we will see it has done so. And, to repeat, as the terms of the Act make clear, it will be no defence in such cases that the offending content was true. All attempts to repeal or modify this speech crime law have been met with blank refusals by Labour and Tory governments alike.

Historically, restrictions on free speech have only been imposed by religious authorities and the state. Today they have been joined in their attack on free expression by educational institutions ('safe spaces' and 'no platforms') and the Internet. Following a reprimand given to Facebook chief Mark Zuckerberg in August 2015 by German Chancellor Merkel for allowing criticisms of her open-door Muslim migrant policy, Internet Spokeswoman Debbie Frost announced that 'we are committed to working with the German government on this important issue.' As a member of the self-promoting, sanctimonious band of 'open border' celebrity campaigners, Zuckerberg was only too willing to comply with Merkel's request when again, in the wake of the Cologne sex assaults by Muslim migrants, the besieged German Chancellor as good as demanded of him that in future,

Facebook delete all accounts by the victims of Muslim migrant sex attacks. YouTube has also exercised a similar censorship, imposed for the same reasons. Palestinian Media Watch and MEMRI, the Middle Eastern Research Institute, perform the invaluable service of making available to the general public videos and translations of Arab and especially Palestinian TV and press, a large part of the output of which is devoted to a vilification of Israel and the Jews. On March 3, 2016, PMW featured via YouTube a video in which a brainwashed child read out on Palestinian Authority TV a poem calling for a war against Israel that would 'destroy the Zionists' soul'. YouTube reacted by terminating PMW's account for 'breaching the company's terms of service', even though all it had done, as in previous, probably for YouTube all-too frequent, transmissions, was to reproduce material created by the Palestinian Authority. Here was a clear case of shooting the messenger. Bombarded by free speech protestors, YouTube rapidly rescinded the ban. Merkel however, persisted in hers, in so doing, reviving practises from the very era which, when it suited her purpose, she invoked to deny to Germans the right to resist the Islamisation of their country. When the comedian Jan Bohmermann satirised Turkey's Islamising President Recip Erdogan's repression of Kurds and Christians, Merkel responded by activating an Imperial German law dating from 1871, the time of Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm the First, which made it the crime of *lese majesté* to 'slander institutions and officials of foreign states', an offence carrying a prison term of up to five years. Merkel however got her comeuppance when, much to her chagrin, on June 1, 2016, with the *dhimmi* (an infidel subservient to Islam) Chancellor and her ministers absenting themselves, the Bundestag voted to acknowledge the fact of the Turkish genocide of 1.5 million Armenians in 1915. The same day, Turkey's ambassador was recalled to Ankara, and Turkish migrants staged a protest at the Brandenburg Gate.

Criticising the beliefs of Muslims, not only in Germany but almost anywhere in western Europe, can be a hazardous undertaking. Threats to free speech come both from avenging Muslim assassins and the law courts. In France, the number of those requiring round-the-clock police protection has escalated as, in contrast with the UK and the USA, public figures display exemplary civic courage by warning of the danger posed by Islam to western civilisation. In what was politically correct Denmark until public opinion persuaded politicians to change their tune, instead of being afforded police protection, a citizen who on Facebook, had likened what he called 'the ideology of Islam' to Nazism, was found guilty of violating the country's hate speech laws. The law in question, which carried either a fine or a prison sentence, makes it an offence to publicly threaten, insult or demean a group of persons on the grounds of their race, skin colour, national or ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation. But the comments made had done no such thing. Like mine, they were aimed, not at a person or persons, but a *belief system*. The two comments judged to be illegal were 'The ideology of Islam is as loathsome, disgusting, oppressive and misanthropic as Nazism'; and 'Islam wishes to abuse democracy to get rid of democracy'. The prosecution claimed that these comments were 'generalising statements' that were 'insulting and demeaning towards adherents of Islam'. (So they could also have been to 'adherents of Nazism') Yet in addition to a certain verse in the *Koran*, number 40 in Chapter 12, which says 'legislation is not but for Allah', there are any number of Muslim clerics and theologians, some of whom I cite in the course of this work, who could, in a court of law, confirm that Islam, which means submission to the will and rule of Allah,

and democracy, which means the rule and will of the people, are incompatible. And, again like Hitler, Muslim clerics and politicians have also used democratic elections to win power and then abolish them, as the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood attempted to do in the wake of the ‘Arab Spring’, and the Ayatollah Khomeini succeeded in doing in Iran. This connection is not an arbitrary one. Hitler was the Muslim Brotherhood’s role model. In his work, *Our Struggle Against the Jews* (1950), Brotherhood leader Ayyid Qutb wrote: ‘Allah sent us Hitler to triumph over them [the Jews], and may he send others too to show the Jews the terrible ways of retribution. In doing so, he will fulfil a plainspoken promise.’

As to the first charge against Islam, that it is as ‘loathsome’ as Nazism, in due course I will provide ample evidence for its validity, But the court was not interested in the truth of the defendant’s comments, in fact it did not challenge them. Its only concern was whether they might (not had) upset sensitive Muslims. Found guilty as charged, with no prospect of an appeal, the defendant was fined the equivalent of £166. Should we be surprised that Jewish sensitivities are not afforded the same protection by Danish courts? (I hasten to add that neither should they be any more than those of Muslims.) Again in Denmark, in October 2014, the imam Al Khaled Samha, faithfully repeating in a sermon what is written, three times, in the *Koran*, described Jews as ‘apes and pigs’. This statement, be it noted, unlike those in the above case, is clearly directed at a group of persons, as defined by their religion, and is therefore, unlike the first case, covered by the act in question. This remark was reported to the police, but on this occasion, no action was taken. Perhaps the thinking was, what kind of a law is it that punishes a man for quoting a passage from his holy book, even if its sentiments bear a remarkable resemblance to those of Adolf Hitler? However, there is quoting and quoting. At the United Nations, a proposal was put before its legislators to make it a crime for non-Muslims to quote, I repeat, *quote*, from the *Koran*, while in Protestant England, a Christian lay preacher was convicted of hate speech by a Muslim judge for quoting from Leviticus. This you could not make up. (See Chapter 28)

In once freedom-loving Holland, we have witnessed the judicial hounding and orchestrated slandering as a racist of Geert Wilders, identical to that endured by Tommy Robinson, founder of the English Defence League. Wilders’ real ‘crime’ had, like Robinson’s, been to call for an end to the Islamisation of his country in order to prevent the erosion of its liberal and tolerant democratic culture. For this, and this alone, again like Robinson, he had been quite falsely described as a right-wing extremist and a racist. (On June 7, 2018, the Tory *Daily Mail* described Robinson, who had never been charged with ‘hate speech’ and had himself been the victim of vicious assaults and death threats by Muslims, as a ‘right wing thug’.) Also the target of numerous death threats from zealots of Obama’s religion of tolerance, Wilders had to live in a secret safe house, wear a bullet proof vest when in public, be protected 24/7 by armed bodyguards, and when on trial for opposing Islam, appear in a court located in an underground bunker. (See Appendix P) I know of no instance where critics of any other religion have been compelled to resort to such measures, yet it is only Islam that is described as a or the ‘religion of peace’. Those who are only too ready to take as good coin the Sharia left and media slander that like Wilders, Robinson is also a ‘far rightist’ should watch and listen to his address to the Oxford Union on YouTube, or read his autobiography, *Enemy of the State*, and then think again. In fact, in so far as he has one, Robinson’s political outlook is a chaotic jumble of both leftist and rightist attitudes. But

none of them are racist, and none of his opponents have been able to prove otherwise. My concern is that he should as much right to air his political views, nearly all of which I totally reject, as anybody, provided that in doing so, he does not break any laws. Let me give one example of what I suspect is an official policy, possibly illegal, of preventing him expressing his political opinions in public. In November 2016, a matter of days before he was due to speak at the Oxford Union, Robinson had been released early from prison after being dubiously convicted, not of 'hate speech', or thuggery, but a mortgage offence. Outrageously, he was warned by his probation officer that if, in the course of his speech, he so much as alluded to Islam, Mohammed or Sharia law, these being the subjects of his address, he would be returned to prison. Robinson's account of this sinister and quite possibly unlawful denial of his right to speak his mind as a guest of the UK's oldest academic institution, surely in its deviousness unprecedented in the history of English jurisprudence, can also be viewed on line. The hounding continued when, on May 25, 2018, Robinson was *secretly* convicted at Leeds Crown Court and illegally sentenced to a jail term of 13 months by a judge, acting alone without a jury, for allegedly breaching his bail conditions on a previous charge of contempt of court for illegally using a camera (outside the court) at a Muslim gang rape case at Canterbury. It took thirty years for the UK justice system to be shamed by *Times* journalist Andrew Norfolk into prosecuting the now notorious Muslim rape gangs that had with impunity been plying their filthy *Koran*-sanctioned trade across the UK. Simply for live streaming (again, *outside* Leeds Crown Court) at one of these trials, when the jury had already arrived at their verdict, and when Sikhs had done the same while the trial was still in progress with expressed police permission, Robinson was sent down, as was proved on appeal, illegally, in a matter of a few minutes. Adding to the distantly Stalinist flavour of the proceedings, the judge imposed a gag on press reporting of the case. After overwhelmingly working-class protests, invariably described by the media as 'far right' (since when did opposing gang rape and illegal convictions become an exclusively right-wing cause?) and counter-demonstrations by even more overwhelmingly middle-class Sharia leftists celebrating the perversion of English justice, Robinson was transferred from medium security Hull prison, with a low Muslim population, to a high-security one in Onley, with a 31% Muslim population, the highest of any category C prison in the UK. He was then for his safety confined in solitary for 23 and half hours a day. On his first night, Muslim inmates, some of whom could well have been convicted child rapists Robinson had campaigned against, pounded on the doors of their cells. None of this was reported by the mainstream media. Released on bail two months later after his conviction had been found on appeal to have been unlawful, Robinson had lost 40 pounds in weight as a result of his refusal to eat food prepared by kitchen staff after threats by Muslim prisoners that he would be poisoned.

Not a single voice in the mainstream media, and virtually none in the legal profession, was raised against Robinson's unprecedented victimisation by the justice system. Instead, there was glee and gloating right across the political spectrum. No MP so much as raised the question of his treatment in the House, even though Parliamentary privilege entitled them to do so. Instead, the privilege was abused when one MP described him as a 'violent racist thug', even though he had neither been convicted of a racist offence or heard to make a single racist comment. In fact, some of his co-campaigners were drawn from a wide range of ethnic and

religious minorities who shared his views about Islam. The unspoken universal consensus was, Robinson had been banged to rights for telling the truth about Islam, and had got what he deserved. Without giving any reasons other than his opposition to Islam (one shared by secularists and atheists who would place themselves on the left, such as the communist Maryam Namazie of the Council of Ex-Muslims of Britain), as if following an agreed script, TV and press coverage ranging from the *Daily Mail* to the *Guardian* invariably described Robinson and his supporters as ‘far right’. (There are good grounds for suspecting that this unanimity was in compliance with a National Union of Journalists policy of always using this term when referring to Robinson.) Yet the Islamophile Corbyn, with his three decades and more of co-habiting with the Stalinist Communist Party of Britain and guesting regularly in the columns of its daily paper, the *Morning Star*, was never correctly described by the media as a fellow traveller of that party or, for that matter, routinely referred to as a ‘far leftist’.

Three weeks after Robinson’s illegal conviction, on June 14, 2018, yet another batch of Muslim gang rapists, the target of ‘far right’ Robinson’s campaigning, were sentenced to a total of 89 years in prison by Oxford Crown Court on charges of rape, conspiracy to rape, indecent assault, false imprisonment and drug dealing. Their victims included girls as young as thirteen years of age. A pious crew indeed. And I am being perfectly serious. As we shall see in due course (Appendix E), save for the drug dealing, about which the *Koran* says nothing, Islam sanctions all of these crimes. So again, one must ask...where were the protests from the Guardianista feminists, the exclusively middle-class ‘Me Tooers’? How many rapes and genital mutilations did it need before they showed at least equal outrage and compassion for the tens of thousands of victims of gang rape and FGM as they did for actresses subjected to a grope on a casting couch?

Repeatedly, unlawfully and vindictively harassed by the police and the justice system and slandered by the media, Robinson’s real offence was to protest against the Islamisation of British society, and not only the refusal of the UK’s political, law enforcement and judicial institutions to take active steps to prevent it, but their collusion in that process. Robinson’s book reveals in some detail, based largely on his own personal encounters with all three, how the police and the criminal justice system were allowing Muslim gangs to enforce Sharia law on the streets and in the jails. And whereas Robinson publicly broke with the EDL after its infiltration by racists, and then conducted dialogues with the Muslim reformist Quilliam Foundation and Black Lives Matter activist Sasha Johnson (available on YouTube), those who falsely accuse him of racism have, without any qualms or similar scruples, collaborated over the years with anti-Semites and Holocaust deniers. If the media, police and the justice system had devoted just a fraction of the time, resources and staff devoted to hounding Robinson to investigating, apprehending and prosecuting those whose illegal and vile practices he was protesting against, tens of thousands of young infidel girls would never have undergone the horrific sexual abuses inflicted on them with impunity by Muslim rape gangs. (See chapter 27 for details)

Let me make one thing perfectly clear. I know from personal experience how some on the left, in order to discredit their opponents, seek to construct what are known in the trade as ‘amalgams’ and by logicians as false syllogisms, in order to falsely treat as identical what are essentially disparate ideas, individuals and groupings. A true syllogism is when two entities are said to be equal to a third, as

in: A equals C, B equals C, therefore, A equals C. A false syllogism, in this case the variant known as the undistributed middle, is to argue, for example, that because all elephants and all rabbits have ears, the two species are also identical in all other respects. In politics, and especially in the media, it has been deployed to slander Robinson as ‘far-rightist’ because there are indeed on the ‘far right’ those who also oppose Islam, but on grounds, those of race, totally opposed to those of Robinson, which, as he made clear on numerous occasions, were cultural. Another device, used to discredit or disprove a proposition, is a false syllogism, known as ‘*ad hominem*’, literally, ‘to the man’, meaning, to seek to refute a proposition by discrediting its source rather than the proposition itself. Again, Robinson has been convicted of offences (in one case, that of alleged mortgage fraud, at the very least, dubiously) that have no bearing whatsoever on his attitude towards Islam. No matter. This fact is repeatedly dredged up to make it seem it has. He gives one example of many in his autobiography. After Robinson was interviewed live on BBC Radio 4, ‘someone published 10 points I should have been put on the spot over. It was stuff like my different names, my criminal record – nothing at all to do with points I was raising, just a personal onslaught aimed at me.’

Yet another variant of what is essentially the same tactic is the attempt to refute one proposition because another, unconnected to the first, but emanating from the same source, is fallacious. Logic requires that all propositions should be judged on their own merits alone, except when they are dependent on, or derived from another known to be false. Thus, in accordance with rules of logic first codified by Aristotle 2,350 years ago, it is false to argue that my condemning the misrepresentation of Robinson’s views on Islam, most of which as it happens, I do share, means I endorse the political views of those he has collaborated with, or that I agree with his political stances on a range of issues that have nothing to do with Islam, for example, Brexit, which he supports, along with a number of far leftist groupings and individuals, while I, also a leftist, oppose, as do a number of Tory elder statesmen. This does not make me a Tory, or these Tories leftists, any more than it does Robinson a far-leftist, or pro-Brexit leftists, critics of Islam. On the contrary, they are invariably opponents of what they call ‘Islamophobia’. By the same token, although I vehemently and repeatedly attack Corbyn in this work on a whole range of questions, in the first place, his stances on Israel and Islam, nowhere in this work do I accuse him of being a neo-Nazi or a Holocaust denier because both have expressed approval of his hostile attitude to Zionism. Precisely this tactic has been used to discredit Robinson as a ‘far rightist’, or in the case of Socialist Workers Party, a ‘fascist’, because some (but as we shall see, far from all) on the far right share his hostility to Islam, as indeed, as we shall see, did Karl Marx. Does this make Robinson a Marxist or Marx a ‘far-rightist’?

As I have already said, as would any free speech advocate, just like anyone else, Robinson should have the right to express his opinions and, again, like anyone else, be entitled to have them accurately reported by the media, which on repeated occasions, has not been the case. In the same spirit, unlike others who had the opportunity and duty to do so, I would, if I had the means, publicly denounce as outrageous the proven illegal and vindictive hounding of Robinson by the police and the justice system in an attempt to sabotage his entirely legal campaigning against what he regards as the negative effects of certain aspects of Islam on British society, including the grooming, trafficking and rape of young, predominately white

girls. And I will say again, because it seems no-one else on the left is prepared to do so, the same police and justice system that spent untold thousands of man-hours and millions of tax-payers' money trying to silence Robinson, for decades could not spare a penny or a minute to hunt down and convict those responsible for the sexual enslavement of tens of thousands of children by Muslim rape gangs, the same criminals who, virtually alone, Robinson was exposing. Yet, I also say, and again, I would if I had the means to do so, say it publicly as I am saying it here now, far from agreeing with his general political orientation, which I reject in toto, I think he was profoundly mistaken in his support for Brexit, which he shares with prominent far-leftist Islamophiles, three (Tory) Prime Ministers, and two (Labour) Leaders of the Opposition, one of them later Prime Minister, not least because the Jihadis Robinson detests would like nothing better than an infidel Europe and NATO torn apart by his brand of populist nationalism.

As I have said, it would be naïve in the extreme to expect that in such a highly-charged subject as Islam, Robinson's enemies would observe the elementary rules of logic. That is why, instead of becoming distracted by issues that have no bearing whatsoever on Islam, and which in addition, serve to provide critics with opportunities to discredit him, Robinson would have been well-advised to confine himself exclusively to his original cause, his exposure of Muslim rape gangs, where his case, as was proved all too belatedly, stood on solid ground.

Wikiquote lists 30 comments by Robinson on Islam. Though not one of them is in any way racist (and I invite the reader to check them), as I have said, it is nevertheless standard practice in the media and amongst mainstream politicians, without ever citing any evidence to substantiate the accusation, to repeat ad nauseum that he is a 'far rightist' or 'right-wing extremist'. One of the best proofs Hope not Hate could come up with for this description was tattoos of Churchill and Magna Carta on Robinson's arm. Does this mean that the barons who assembled at Runnymede on June 15, 1215, to lay the first foundation stone of English and, centuries later, American democracy and liberties, and the politician who opposed the appeasement of Hitler and then led his nation to victory over him, were also 'right wing extremists'? Others, depending on who they are, can say what he says about Islam, and they are not subjected to the same slanders. Both Robinson and the Somalia-born Muslim apostate, author and campaigner for Muslim women's rights Ayaan Hirsi Ali have compared Islam to Nazism and fascism. One has said 'Nazism and Islamism are opposite sides of the same coin' and the other, that 'Islam is the new fascism.' Can the reader say with certainty who said which, and explain how saying it is evidence of 'right wing extremism'?

When, for example, Robinson said, as he did after the murder and attempted decapitation of Fusilier Lee Rigby outside Woolwich barracks in May 2013 by two recent Muslim converts, that 'Islam is not a religion of peace', this is seen as proof of his anti-Muslim bigotry. Then what are we to make of the assertion by Ayatollah Khomeini, the Supreme Leader of Iran, a state which has employed on its Press TV channel the services of a galaxy of anti-Zionist western politicians ranging from Jeremy Corbyn, George Galloway and Ken Livingston on the far left to former KKK Grand Wizard and Hitler admirer David Duke on the far right, that 'those who know nothing of Islam pretend that Islam counsels against war' and that he 'spits on the foolish souls that make such a claim.'? Is he too, the most authoritative living voice of Shi'a Islam, an 'Islamophobe'? Or a racist? On the contrary. As we shall see, he and his theocratic regime have been hailed on the far left as

intransigent foes of an anti-Islamic, 'imperialist' West. The absurdities do not stop there. When the US neurologist and author Sam Harris, who locates himself on the secular left, vehemently asserted that 'to call Islam a religion of peace, as we hear ceaselessly re-iterated, is completely delusional', no-one in his audience demurred. When critics of Islam are respected academics and writers, as in a televised 'Intelligence Squared' debate on the motion that 'Islam is a religion of peace' (defeated by 55 votes to 36, with nine abstentions), with the two opponents of the motion being Hirsi Ali (again) and *Spectator* journalist, author and political commentator Douglas Murray and, in another debate on the same motion, the not so ex-Trotskyist atheist author Christopher Hitchens, again, they are not shouted down with organised chanting, as was attempted (unsuccessfully) when Robinson spoke on Islam at the Oxford Union, but applauded for a well-presented argument. This is a text-book example of *ad hominem*, of not what is said, but who says it.

The tactics used today to discredit and if possible, silence critics of Islam go back many centuries. Any Christian who challenged the corruption and heresies of the Roman church ran the risk of being accused by the Inquisition of acting as accomplices of Satan, while in the French Revolution, not bonfires but trumped up accusations of royalism and then the guillotine awaited anyone on the left who doubted the fitness of Robespierre to guide the affairs of the Jacobins. Such was the fate of Georges Danton and his friend Camille Desmoulins, both falsely accused of royalism. Lenin, who revered Robespierre as the model of a revolutionary, similarly denounced and arrested leaders of rival socialist parties as 'white-guardists', while his successor Stalin simply updated the same device by substituting 'fascists' for 'white guardists' to achieve the same end, in purges and assassinations that counted millions among their victims, the most famous being Trotsky and Bukharin. Today, it is secularists and free speech advocates who are in the firing line, slandered as racists, 'Islamophobes' and Nazis. Dutch citizens who tweeted their opposition to the construction of Muslim migrant centres in their town were subjected to the same state harassment as Robinson. They were visited by the police and charged with, I quote, 'sedition'. A Dutchman who publicly complained of Muslim school children cheering in class the news of the Brussels massacres of March 2016 answered a knock on the door only to find himself confronted by three policemen. This happened, not in Putin's Russia, but liberal democratic Holland, a nation which, since its revolt against Spanish oppression, has been a beacon of freedom and toleration in Europe, the land of the free-thinking Jew, Spinoza, and of Grotius, the founder of international law. (See Appendix P) The policing of what can be expressed in public about Islam is a gangrene spreading through Europe, a continent that for all its liberal democratic traditions and constitutions, nowhere legally protects the right to free speech and a free press in the manner and sense of the USA's First Amendment. What is evolving is a kind of Allah's Law, one that can best be defined in mathematical terms: As the number and scale of atrocities carried out by Muslims accumulates, so do the severity and number of restrictions on what can be said about the faith that inspires them. The shameful truth is that governments of Germany, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and the UK, like many other European states, instead of defending the right of their citizens to freely speak on important issues of the day, are creating laws, harassing and prosecuting journalists, writers and politicians, and imposing rulings in ways that conform to demands for censorship made by the OIC, the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, and a number of officially secular international organisations.

That the privileging of religion in general, and Islam in particular, is indeed the purpose of these so-called hate speech laws was stated unequivocally by a European Commissioner in 2008. Their purpose was to ‘preserve peace and public order’ by protecting what was defined, tactfully, as the ‘increased sensitivities of certain individuals who have reacted violently to criticism of their religion’. Who says crime doesn’t pay? Offended and sensitive Muslims create illegal mayhem over a few lines in a book they will not and most cases could not have read or an image most of them will not have seen, and yet someone who has peacefully and, so they mistakenly assumed, legally expressed an adverse opinion of the religion that fuels this violence, is the one to be penalised. Surely by now European politicians should know, appeasement of thuggery never works, at least, not for the appeaser. After the enactment of a battery of hate speech laws designed specifically to protect Islam from criticism, thus removing at least one of the causes of Muslim violence, ‘certain individuals’ yet again ‘reacted violently’ by staging two massacres in the heart of Paris, others in Nice and in Brussels, and attempting countless more that were detected before their execution. What more proof do we need that like Chamberlain’s policy of appeasing Hitler, so-called ‘hate speech laws’ do not work? As the laws to curb criticism of Islam multiply, so threats of and actual Muslim violence increase, just as one would expect. The passage of these laws is seen as proof that Islam is winning in its campaign of intimidation. So yet more is demanded. Islam does not just want its critics to be silenced. True to its name, Islam requires their *submission*.

Like all totalitarian doctrines, be they religious or secular, left or right, Islam is driven by a deep and irrational yearning for a world without controversy or dissent, one that in the words of the Jacobin ideologue Antoine Saint Juste, is subordinated to ‘a single will’, whether in this instance that of a Caliph or an Ayatollah, or in analogous despotisms, of a Platonic philosopher king, Eastern potentate, Pope, General Secretary, *Duce* or *Fuehrer*. As their antithesis in every respect, liberal democracy not only permits, but embraces and draws upon diversity of opinion and intellectual friction as its very lifeblood and, as in the First Amendment to the US Constitution and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, sets as wide limits as are practically possible to allow them to do their creative work in every field of human endeavour. After centuries of trial and error, and at horrendous cost, Western civilisation learned the truth of the German Enlightenment philosopher Emmanuel Kant’s Darwinian dictum that ‘man wishes concord, but nature, knowing better what is good for his species, wishes discord’. The results are there for all to see, though tragically, they can be not only the object of envy of many who are not allowed to share them, but also of fear, contempt and even hatred. But judged by their retreat before the demands and threats of Islam, our political leaders have been persuaded that genuine, free, diversity of belief and opinion, and the creative friction they necessarily generate, endanger ‘community cohesion’ and therefore need to be contained and even suppressed, while the destructive (to the host nation) cultural friction generated by Islam in ‘*dar el harb*, the land of the infidel, is both denied and at the same time, encouraged (as with, for example, sharia courts) and even rewarded, with state funded all-Muslim schools that promote Muslim self-segregation, anti-Semitism and even Jihadism. (See Chapter 26)

This onslaught on free thought and speech (for how can thoughts be genuinely free be when one dares not express them?) permeates every aspect and level of our

once freer society. Fear of the law, social ostracism, job dismissal and the possibility of violent reprisals by the offended parties inevitably tends to inhibit what individuals are prepared to say not only in public but among friends and work colleagues about Islam, as well as about an expanding number of other 'off limits' topics. I have had personal experience of this. As the Jay Report established, fear of accusations of racism (to which we can add, 'Islamophobia', since the report, for obvious reasons, never refers to it) was the root cause of the Rotherham Muslim gang rape scandal. This fear has created a climate of unacknowledged self-censorship which now extends to the media. I was on the receiving end of one such exercise when I wrote to my local paper, the *Swansea Evening Post*, to vent my anger at the deportation of a gay Nigerian after the rejection of his asylum claim. He had fled to the UK after his partner had been murdered simply for being gay and had good reason to believe the same fate awaited him on his return, either at the hands of the law, or a religiously motivated lynch mob. I reproduce below the letter as I wrote it, and below again, as it appeared in the *Post*

After reading your story in Tuesday's *Post*, I was outraged and ashamed that this country is deporting a Nigerian man to face the near certainty of either rotting in a Christian jail or being stoned to death by Muslims simply because he is gay. I am at a loss to understand why, when Europe, including the UK, has been prepared to unconditionally accept over a million asylum seekers in the space of less than a year, we cannot find room for one man whose case, on the basis of the evidence cited by the *Post*, is irrefutable.

After reading your story in Tuesday's *Post*, I was outraged and ashamed that this country is deporting a Nigerian man to face the near certainty of either rotting in a jail or being stoned to death simply because he is gay. I am at a loss to understand why, when Europe, including the UK, has been prepared to unconditionally accept over a million asylum seekers in the space of less than a year, we cannot find room for one man whose case, on the basis of the evidence cited by the *Post*, is irrefutable.

I should point out that the *Post* had itself cited the punishments for homosexuality in Nigeria, 20 years or more jail in the (Christian) south, and stoning to death in the (Muslim) north. All I had done was identify the two religions that he feared would persecute him for his homosexuality should he be returned to his homeland. I could have said much more about Islam's treatment of homosexuals, and that a sizable percentage of those I described as asylum seekers would have been homophobic Muslim economic migrants. But I did not. However, the little that I did say was evidently two words, or rather one, too many. And they were excised, not because they were untrue, *but because they were true*. Yes, some Christian readers may have been offended by my allusion to their religion's teachings on homosexuality, and one or two might even have written a reply objecting to what I had said. But that would have been that. However, as the editor of the *Post* would have been well aware, even though the views expressed were not his own, among Muslim readers would have been some whose reactions might have been very different to those of offended Christians. Hence the deletion.

But this was not the end of the story. All my letters to the *Post* on a wide variety of topics had been published, until in the Spring of 2018, I submitted four in succession, each of them in response to an item in the paper, and each of which was

refused publication without any explanation as to why. The first, which I now believe rendered me *persona non testatus*, was on a Muslim youth event in Cardiff, which quoted its organiser as saying that the word 'Islam' means peace. In my letter I quoted an Islamic website that said this was incorrect, and that the word means 'submission'. The site in question, *Islamic Learning Materials*, could not have been more specific or categorical in its rejection of 'peace' as the correct meaning of the word 'Islam': 'Before going much further, let's get one thing clear Islam does not mean "peace". It doesn't. I'm sorry, Muslim apologists. I've gotta speak the truth.' And that 'truth' was that 'the word "Islam" means "submission". It means to completely give up and cease resistance against a stronger power.' Another Islamic website I consulted but did not cite, *Islam Question and Answer*, also contradicted the Cardiff imam: Islam means 'submission, humbling [sic - correct usage] oneself, and obeying commands and heeding prohibitions without objection.' Be it noted that I took neither side, but merely noted the discrepancy. My next letter concerned a feature on global infant mortality. A diagram in the *Post* showed that Pakistan had by far the highest rate in the world, even though it had 16 times more medical staff per capita than war-torn and much poorer Somalia, with an appalling GDP 1% of the world average compared to Pakistan's 9%. I wrote a letter, citing Pakistan government statistics that showed that while spending on health had fallen over the previous decade, military spending was on the rise. I also pointed out that though Pakistan had the highest infant mortality rate in the world, its rulers could afford to maintain 600,000 military personnel and a nuclear weapons capacity, and was the recipient of vast amounts of western aid. I never so much as alluded to Islam being the cause, since Somalia is also Islamic. I was simply drawing attention to the priorities of Pakistan's ruling elite. The last two letters concerned what had also apparently become a taboo subject so far as I was concerned...the pro Shi'a Islam foreign policy of Jeremy Corbyn, specifically, his support for the Ba'athist regime of President Assad of Syria:

While endorsing Greg Wilkinson's support for strikes against President Assad's chemical facilities (*Post*, April 17) I need to correct him on one point. Corbyn describes himself, not as a pacifist, but as a peace campaigner. His concern for peace has not, however, proved any obstacle to his enjoying well-documented close associations over many years with movements which have been anything but peaceful in their intentions towards Israel, two of which, Hamas and Hezbollah, in their statements of aims, call for Israel's destruction, and yet both of which, in an unguarded moment, Corbyn can be seen on YouTube describing as his "friends" and praising them for their readiness to conduct a "dialogue" with a state they explicitly do not even recognise the existence of. Corbyn has complained that the UK government carried out its attack without seeking in advance the consent of Parliament or the United Nations. Yet I cannot recall Corbyn taking to task Hamas for similarly failing to seek consent from any elected body in the Gaza Strip or from the United Nations before its entirely unprovoked attack on Israel in 2014, which involved the kidnapping and murder of three Jewish civilians and firing rockets and tunnelling into Israeli territory, all three of which constitute acts of war as defined by the United Nations in Resolution 3314, Article 3, sections a, b and g, passed unanimously by the General Assembly in 1974. Neither can I recall Corbyn condemning any of these illegal attacks. But I clearly recall his denunciation of Israel for responding to them, as it was entitled to do according to the same United Nations resolution Article 6. Corbyn is a peace campaigner with a difference.

And number four:

In your story 'Demo voices opposition to UK military action in Syria' (*Post*), April 18, 2018) you fail to mention that this 'action' was directed, not at a civilian target, unlike those authorised by Syria's President Asad and Russia's President Putin, but at a chemical facility. Instead, you described the protest as one against a 'bombing raid in Syria'. Not even the Syria regime has claimed there were any casualties as a result of this raid, unlike the victims of its chemical attacks. To the best of my knowledge, no one has taken to the streets of Swansea to protest against atrocities committed by any Arab regime in the Middle East, not even those of the Islamic State. Only when action is taken to curb them does it become a cause for protest. I can quite easily visualise protestors of this sanctimonious mind set chanting 'not in my name' in the Second World War had the Allies chosen to bomb the Germany factory manufacturing Zyklon B, the gas used by the Nazis to murder millions of Jews.

It would seem that any topic which, however remotely, touches on Islam, can be deemed off-limits, in case it risks 'giving offence' to its followers or, as Corbyn has it, fails to give it the respect it claims is its due. There was a time when professional whingers and offence takers were regarded as harmless and even endearing figures of fun, and a subject for gentle satire. We had the Colonel Blimps waging lone crusades against the onward march of the modern age, a world where everything was going to the dogs, signing their letters to the broadsheets 'disgusted of Tunbridge Wells'. No longer. Islam's vicious and increasingly desperate war against the secular modern world is waged not with the pen or the vocal chords, which of course would be totally acceptable, but with jet planes flown into skyscrapers, suicide bombers in metro stations and carriages, airports, schools and cafes, videoed mass executions, burnings alive, decapitations and crucifixions, the rape of Christian girls, massacres with Kalashnikovs on tourist beaches, in hotels, shopping malls, class rooms, editorial offices, dancehalls, Jewish schools, museums and supermarkets, all carried out by Muslims. The old and wise saying, 'sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me' no longer applies, at least not to offended Muslims. It should now read: 'Your words hurt me, so I will break your bones'.

When saying something all concerned know to be true can result in criminal proceedings and a jail sentence of up to seven years, those who value their liberty but fail to protest against such outrages are digging a grave for the burial of the very freedoms that have brought them a quality of life unparalleled in the history of the human race. The reader may think I exaggerate. If so, please be patient. In due course, we shall see one can even be arrested for hate speech for reading out in public, under a Tory Prime Minister, the writings of his most illustrious predecessor, Winston Churchill, or under this same (and unlike Churchill) also avowedly Christian Prime Minister, a passage from the book which is the prime text of England's official religion.

Anyone who believes that in UK, its citizens are living in a land where there is free speech with no buts, where we are free to say what we like about ideas we do not agree with, either simply does not understand what genuine free speech is, or is unaware of the increasing number of legal restrictions that over the last two decades have been imposed upon it. The reader has no doubt found it hard to credit that both at the United Nations and in Canada, laws have been proposed that if enacted, will make it criminal offence for a non-Muslim to criticise *or even simply reproduce*

certain passages from the *Koran*. And with the two cases in Austria in mind, who in the western world can say for certain that similar laws will never appear on the statute books of their country?

Even in the USA, in deference to demands by various Muslim pressure groups that had the ear of President Obama, an (unsuccessful) attempt was made by Democratic Party legislators to subvert and circumvent the protection of free speech under the First Amendment by the passing of a bill that would outlaw an undefined 'hateful and anti-Muslim speech'. (See Appendix B) In the light of these measures and proposals, one may reasonably ask, why does a faith that never tires of vaunting its perfection and superiority over all other belief systems; has as its goal either the conversion or subjugation of all humanity; today can boast of nearly two billion followers world-wide; is the official religion of 56 states; and commands the greater part of the world's known oil reserves, nevertheless feel itself in need of a level of legal protection from criticism, re-enforced by threats of and actual violence, that no other religion, let alone secular political doctrine, demands or, if it did, would receive? It is for the same reason that when the religion of *Jihad* finds itself not being awarded the respect it feels it deserves, its young male zealots either run amok in paroxysms of blind rage, or relapse into infantile tantrums and displays of self-pity and simulated victimhood. These are classic symptoms of the most profound feelings of insecurity and inferiority, caused by the ever-widening gulf between what Allah has promised his faithful, and the wretched, abject, humiliating reality of the state and status of the world of Islam today. Something, or rather somebody, must therefore be to blame. And of course, as it has been down the ages, culminating in the genocidal hatreds of the Nazis, it must be the Jews. Those on the left like Corbyn who, as matter of principle, refused to criticise Islamic regimes and terrorist movements for their visceral anti-Semitism do so, wittingly or otherwise, according to a rule enunciated by the doyen of western anti-Zionism, Noam Chomsky. In his own words, it goes like this.

My own concern is primarily the terror and violence carried out by my own state. For one thing, because it happens to be the larger component of international violence. But also for a much more important reason than that; namely, I can do something about it. So even if the US was responsible for only 2% of the violence in the world, instead of the majority of it, it would be that 2% that I would be primarily responsible for.

It follows from this axiom that the only government one is entitled to criticise is one's own, since it is this government alone that is elected by one's vote and financed by one's taxes, and is therefore the only one for which one is in part at least, responsible and accountable. Followed to its logical and indeed practical conclusion, and this is indeed exactly what Chomsky says, this will mean that any violation of human rights for which one's own government is not responsible must go unprotested; for example, for the duration of the Third Reich, a citizen of the USA would not, indeed should not have been expected to protest against the Nazi persecution and genocide of the Jews, which even Chomsky might be persuaded to concede was at least largely work of the Hitler regime and not the United States, whose government from December 1941 was in fact at war with those who were carrying it out, and whose armed forces played a major part in liberating Europe from its tyranny. Protesting against the crimes of the Nazis was solely the

responsibility of Germans, albeit under a regime that punished any public dissent from its policies and actions with at the very least, incarceration in a concentration camp. Though renowned for his political activism, anyone applying Chomsky's version of internationalism will with a good conscience be entitled to ignore the sins of every government in the world save their own - with one exception - Israel's. How this principle worked in practice was demonstrated when the London *Times* carried a story in November 2007 with the headline 'Gays should be hanged, says Iranian Minister'. (As indeed they are) One reader well and truly hooked on cultural relativism replied online to the effect that the *Times* was at fault in reporting the story, not the Iranian theocracy for hanging gays: 'When is the West going to learn not to meddle in other nations' affairs? It is none of our business what they do. It is their country, their culture'. True. But then, was it also wrong for anti-racists in the 'West' to 'meddle in the affairs' of Apartheid South Africa? After all, racism was the ruling white minority's 'culture'. By the same token, strictly applying the Chomsky principle would have required that no protest should have been made by anyone outside the USSR against the suppression by the Red Army of workers' uprisings in East Germany in 1953 and Hungary in 1956, and the invasions of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and Afghanistan in 1979 and more recently, against similar Russian operations in Ukraine. (See Appendix XIV)

Even Chomsky, loathe as he was to criticise any government save his own and that of Israel (the latter involving a violation of his own axiom), would surely have to concede that as in Nazi Germany, public protest by Soviet citizens against a regime not noted for its toleration of dissent would have been a more hazardous undertaking than a similar action by Chomsky against the government of the USA for its criminal role in Vietnam. Surely in such situations, the onus is on those who are free to protest, to speak out on behalf of those who are not. And yet Chomsky's idiosyncratic brand of internationalism led him during the Soviet era to decline invitations to associate himself with protests against the refusal of the Kremlin to allow Soviet Jews, the so-called 'refuseniks', to emigrate, and generally, against the persecution of Jews in Arab states. But when it came to denouncing Israel, Chomsky was only too willing to make an exception to his own rule and, what is more, expected others to follow his example. And as we shall see in due course, Chomsky was also prepared to make another exception to his own axiom by joining with French Neo-Nazis in a campaign to defend the academic freedom of a Holocaust-denying professor of literature at Lyon University, even though the authorities attacking it were French, not those of the USA.

There was a pattern to Chomsky's political commitments, or in some notable cases, to a lack of them, and the key to understanding both, as the above cases would suggest, was his attitude to the Jews. When the Jews were victims, as they were in the case of the Soviet refuseniks and under the Arabs, he was silent because, we were led to assume, the US government was not in any sense culpable. But when a French Neo-Nazi academic told lies about the history of the Jews, Chomsky sprang to his defence, even though in this case, the target of his protest was not his own government but the authorities of Lyon University. In issues relating to the Middle East, which over the years had been Chomsky's main political pre-occupation, if not obsession, pressed on the apparent inconsistencies of his stance on human rights abuses in the region, he would argue that since many, if not most of the sins of the world can be traced back to the actions of the United States (and he would add its Zionists accomplices), what might appear to the uninitiated US citizen to be the

human rights abuses of Islamic regimes were in fact simply the inevitable outcome of US foreign policy, and it was therefore against that policy, and that policy alone, that protests had to be directed, not the perpetrators of massacres of Christians, the kidnapping and murder of Israeli Jews, the suicide bombings of mosques, the atrocious persecution of gays, the oppression of women, the burning alive, crucifixion and beheading of infidels. But even if it were true - and it is not - that the USA exercises a virtual global monopoly on political crime, the irony is, this would leave those of us in the rest of the world with very little to protest about.

However, without saying so in so many words, Chomsky found a way around this self-imposed limitation. Because of the sheer enormity and ubiquity of the crimes perpetrated by United States and their Israeli accomplices (or was it the other way around?), special dispensation was given to the entire world's population to demonstrate their hatred of all things American and Zionist, while ignoring, excusing, condoning and even applauding atrocities committed by Muslims in the name of Islam. But what of that part of humanity, not far short of a majority one suspects, for whom any opposition to or criticism of their authorities is either illegal or at best, a risky business? Since Chomsky was convinced, and had convinced many others, including those who should have known better, that the root cause of the problems of the Arab/Muslim world was to be found, not in Mecca or Tehran, but in Jerusalem and Washington, it followed that the only legitimate target for the peoples of the Muslim world was not their domestic oppressors, but a US-led 'western imperialism' and Israel, the one country in the Middle East where, as Chomsky well knew, unlike all 56 Islamic states, its citizens, Arab and Jew alike, had the right to demonstrate as well as vote against their government. And this of course suited the rulers of these benighted states admirably, just as placing the blame for their country's problems on alien foes did for Hitler and Stalin. As we shall see, this argument, for what it was worth, succeeded in convincing otherwise intelligent, well-educated and quite moral people that it is deeply wrong to speak out in support of victims of persecution in countries ruled by Islam, be they gays, Kurds, Christians, feminists, democrats, leftists, trade unionists, poets, atheists, secularists, free thinkers, apostates, Muslims dissidents or human rights campaigners. Mere abstention from protest however was not enough. Those who broke ranks by denouncing the violation of human rights in countries other than the liberal democratic west had to be branded as racists, Islamophobes, imperialist stooges or, if they were Arabs or Muslims, traitors and, if they were Jews, genocidists and Nazis.

Readers may find it hard to credit that in addition to championing beyond the call of duty the cause of those who deny the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews, Chomsky engaged in his own version of Holocaust denial when he refused to accept as true the well-authenticated reports of the scale of the slaughter under the rule of Pol Pot, when in the years between 1975 and 1979, 1.7 million Cambodians were killed by the Khmer Rouge, 21% of the population. Replying to a favourable review in the *New York Times* of a book on the Cambodian tragedy, Chomsky accused the reviewer of retailing 'extreme anti-Khmer Rouge distortions' that had been 'manufactured' to present the west in a more favourable light...hardly necessary in this case, one would have thought, but evidently Chomsky believed otherwise.

While Chomsky liked to pose as the doubter *par excellence* who will not accept as true anything complimentary about a country or a government until he has eliminated any possibility of bias or factual error, this principle was only applied

to the USA and Israel. When the enemies of these countries were under consideration, or indeed any state or movement that could be portrayed, no matter how tendentiously, as a victim of the west, Chomsky was transformed from a hardnosed sceptic into one of Lenin's 'useful idiots', one who would swallow in one gulp anything so long as it fed his unbridled loathing of his own country and his own Jewishness. Instead of the accurate account favourably reviewed by the (left-leaning) *New York Times*, Chomsky's sole source for what happened in Cambodia under Pol Pot was a work based purely on official regime sources and what its gullible (at best) authors were not allowed to see. He went further, promoting it as the most accurate guide available, quoting, for example, the following: 'Here and there [sic] there were bodies...it was difficult to tell whether they were people who had succumbed [sic] to the difficulties [sic] of the [forced] march [out of the capital Phnom Penh by its entire population] or simply civilians and soldiers killed in the last battles'; and another 'witness', who claimed that there were 'deaths, but not thousands, as certain newspapers [sic] have written'. True, 'not thousands', but 1.7 million. Despite the irrefutable evidence of Khmer Rouge atrocities that was already available, it was this fictitious version that constituted sufficient proof for Professor Chomsky to conclude that 'massacre reports were false', 'a horror summary' that could be safely dismissed as simply anti-communist western propaganda. "The 'slaughter'" (Chomsky's ironic quotes) by the Khmer Rouge was 'a *New York Times* fabrication', just as his Holocaust-denying friends said the Nazi's extermination of the Jews was a Zionist one. And here we have another application of the Chomsky rule. Never believe what the 'establishment' press of one's own country says, because it has a vested interest in telling lies, unless of course the item in question is from the pen of Noam Chomsky. But a recycled Khmer Rouge denial of its own atrocities...that's a different matter entirely. Even after it became impossible for the selectively gullible professor to deny the scale of Pol Pot's auto-genocide, Chomsky complained that 'the positive [sic] side of the picture has been virtually edited out'...like that of Stalin and Mao perhaps, for all their tens of millions of victims, which is indeed what Corbynista loyalist Diane Abbott argued in defence of the Chinese despot during a BBC discussion programme in 2008, and Corbyn's Press Officer, Seumas Milne, on behalf of Stalin, in the *Guardian*.

The same Chomsky principle that led to his denial of the Cambodian genocide is also applied today by Islam apologists in matters theological. Since Christianity, whether one believes in it or not, is 'our' religion in a sense analogous to the US government being a US citizen's whether they voted for it or not, it follows that all the misdeeds committed in the name of that religion, such as attempts to promote Creationism in schools, the murder of abortion clinic staff, or the Vatican's ban on the use of condoms to prevent AIDS, are judged fair game. And rightly so. But not those committed in the name of Islam, because Islam is not 'ours', but the faith of people sinned against and persecuted by the Christian West. Thus while atheists and secularists are always ready to denounce the failings and sins of Christianity with great gusto, among them there will always be those who will in the next breath defend Islam against the entirely well-founded charge that on any meaningful scale of measurement, be it numbers of victims, intolerance, rejection of democracy and civil liberties, wanton cruelty, punishment of apostates, misogyny, homophobia and the rest, contemporary Islam far outweighs the misdeeds of modern Christianity at its most fundamentalist.

This is just one aspect of a far larger phenomenon. For nearly a century now, since the advent of Bolshevism and then its various derivatives, swathes of the left have been plagued, and their credibility necessarily undermined, by the adoption of double standards in all matters pertaining to individual freedom. Following the establishment of the Bolshevik dictatorship in Russia 1917, many on the left found it expedient to ignore, excuse or deny its flagrant suppression of democracy and civil liberties, for fear that to do otherwise would, as Orwell put it so succinctly, 'play into the hands of the enemy'. From its *ad hoc* beginnings, this tactic evolved over the decades into an entire system of organised lying, a kind of political double entry book-keeping in which the sins, real, exaggerated or invented, of the western democracies were denounced in the most vociferous terms, while the same, or often far worse crimes committed by Lenin and his successors were either denied or applauded as necessary measures for the defence of socialism; for example, the disbanding of the democratically elected Constituent Assembly in January, 1918 in which Bolsheviks had only 20% of the delegates, the suppression of the Kronstadt sailors in 1921, Lenin's establishment of history's first one party state, the Stalinist purges and famine of the 1930s, the slave labour camps, Stalin's pact with Hitler in August 1939 that carved up Poland and unleashed the Second World War, the suppression by the Red Army of the East German workers' uprising of 1953 and of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, the Warsaw Pact invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968, and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979...the list of what had to be either denied, lied about or defended seems endless.

Forty years and more after the event, I still have vivid memories of this last exercise in leftist double standards. A matter of days before the Red Army invasion of Afghanistan on the night of December 24, 1979, the leftist-controlled Campaign for (unilateral) Nuclear Disarmament (in later years, one of its leading activists, Communist Party fellow traveller Jeremy Corbyn, would be both CND vice chair and vice president) staged a massive march and rally in London. Ostensibly a peace march, its organisers ensured that its 100,000 or so participants were left under no illusion that, again in accordance with the Chomsky rule, the demonstration was targeting only western nuclear weapons, something I established when I attempted to express my opposition to the no less lethal and substantial Soviet nuclear arsenal. I was promptly advised by a march steward to either shut up or leave the march. Heavily outnumbered by Kremlin loyalists, I wisely chose the second option. Then, days later, came the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet regime of peace. A handful of Afghan exiles in London replied to the Kremlin rape of their homeland by staging another march and rally in the capital. I and my wife, together with a long-standing friend and comrade, arrived at the muster point to discover, though not with any great surprise, that we were the only non-Afghans on the march. This was a full-scale, unprovoked invasion by a nuclear super power of a virtually defenceless country possessing territory, resources and a population only tiny fractions of those of its Soviet occupiers. So where were the 100,000 anti-war protesters of but a few days previously? (What a contrast with the mobilisation of the left against the US war on the Taliban after 9/11.) In my Labour Party branch, a motion I moved deploring the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan scraped through by a majority of one, after a speech by a Stalinist 'entryist' (one of several in attendance) describing the Kremlin's puppet regime in Kabul as, quote, the 'democratically elected government of Afghanistan'.

To prepare you for the surreal world you are about to enter, one where as in that of 1984, war is peace, and freedom slavery, think on this. In ultra-PC Toronto, Canada, a football match is in progress between a team from a Catholic school and one from a Muslim one. With the Catholic team leading 3 goals to 1, the Muslim team suddenly notices that two of the Catholic team, in accordance with the league's rules, are girls. The Muslim team threatens to walk off the pitch unless the two girls are removed, as their presence violates Sharia gender segregation laws (and, one suspects no less their sense of Muslim male honour at the prospect of losing to a team fielding two doubly inferior members of the human species). Not wishing to give offence, the *dhimmi* officials of the Catholic team duly comply. Perhaps without realising it, they had set a precedent. Football in a non-Islamic country can be played according to Sharia law, just as Islamic states can exclude women competitors from their Olympic teams on religious grounds without suffering any penalty whatsoever, whereas apartheid South Africa could be expelled from the entire international sporting community for excluding non-whites from their teams on the basis of a reading of a passage in the Old Testament. A matter of days after the Catholic Church's capitulation to Islamic gender apartheid in Toronto, at another football match, this time in a village south of Baghdad, an Islamic State suicide bomber blows himself up, killing 32 spectators and wounding 65 more, many of them young boys. All the victims are of course Muslims, but the wrong sort, being Shi'as and not Sunnis. Football for some Muslims is evidently not so much a sport as an opportunity to impose doctrinal orthodoxy, because on May 13, the Islamic State struck yet again, massacring 16 and wounding 25 members of a Real Madrid Supporters Club gathered at a café in the Shi'ite town of Balad in northern Iraq. As in Toronto and Baghdad, another blow had been struck by Allah for theological correctness.

Meanwhile, back in the UK, a lunacy of a less lethal, but not totally unrelated order, was underway. In the Autumn of 2015, there began appearing on websites devoted to the adulation of Labour's newly elected Leader postings by party members attributing to the Jews a number of historic events. To whet the reader's appetite, I list three: the assassination of President Kennedy; the death of Princess Dianna and...yes, of course, you guessed ...the sinking of the Titanic. Now read on.

A Note on Islamic Sources

Since the main emphasis in much of this work is on Islam in all its rich and manifold aspects, unlike its either deluded or dissembling infidel apologists, I quote extensively from the faith's foundational and therefore indisputably defining texts. These are principally the *Koran*, the *Sunna*, being the sayings and deeds ascribed to Mohammed and collected in the *Hadith*, and the earliest known biography of the prophet, by Ibn Ishaq, *Sirat Rasul Allah*, which dates from the first century after the death of Mohammed in AD 632. I should stress that I only cite from those *Hadith* that are almost universally accepted by Muslim scholars and clerics as being entirely trustworthy, principally those of Bukhari. Whether they are in fact true is for my purposes irrelevant, because nearly all Muslims believe they are, and are expected to behave accordingly. As we know to our cost, far too many do. The *Hadith* carry considerable doctrinal weight, with one calculation ascribing no more than 20% of Islam to the *Koran*, while the remainder, including the bulk of Sharia

law, derives from the *Hadith* and approved biographies of the religion's founder. For example, while numerous Koranic verses - something in the order of two hundred - exhort Muslims to kill, convert, subjugate, plunder, rape, or enslave the unbeliever, not one is devoted to either the rules for prayer or the so-called 'Five Pillars of Islam'. A cynic might say that this omission betrayed Mohammed's order of priorities.

Varieties of Terror

Sections of this work are concerned with terror attacks by Muslims on both Muslims and non-Muslims in the name of Islam. One of a plethora of relevant Koranic verses runs thus: 'I [Allah] am with you. Therefore, make firm those who believe. I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Therefore, strike off their heads and strike off every finger-tip of them.' (Chapter 8, Verse 12) Islamic terror, as the *Koran* makes clear, is not conducted in the name of liberating an oppressed people from a tyrant, but directed at those who refuse to bow the knee to the rule of Allah...hence the assassin's cry, *Allahu Akbar*...God is the Greatest. (For the relevant Koranic citations, see Appendix L) The history of Christianity has provided us with a similar example of holy terror directed against unbelievers...the Spanish Inquisition, whose last mass burning of heretics took place in 1728. But Islamic terror continues.

Secular terror is of more recent origin, its first explicit use, which also involved, like Allah's, the striking off of heads, occurring during the French Revolution under the rule of the Jacobins. As in Soviet Russia, nearly all its most zealous advocates, in the first place Robespierre and Saint-Just, subsequently became its victims. Terror, said Robespierre in a speech to the Convention, is 'nothing more than speedy, severe and inflexible justice.' From the first days of the Bolshevik regime, Lenin, who took the Jacobins as his model, also made no secret of his readiness to use terror against his political opponents, posing to his second in command Trotsky the obviously rhetorical question, 'do you really think we shall be victorious without using the cruelest terror?' (There was a profound irony in this justifying of terror 'from above'. Lenin's elder brother, Alexander, had been executed for his involvement in a terrorist action 'from below', a failed attempt to assassinate Tsar Alexander III in 1887.)

Then we have other terrors 'from above', that of the Nazi Gestapo and Himmler's genocidal Waffen SS, General Franco's during and after the Spanish Civil War, and General Pinochet's after his coup of September 1973. In each of these cases, the terror was directed *downwards*, by regimes that like Lenin's, Islam's and the Inquisition, would not tolerate the least dissent, let alone legal opposition. But there is another kind of terror, tyrannicide, terror 'from below' directed upwards. Those German army officers and their civilian collaborators who in July 1944, risked and gave their lives in their failed attempt to assassinate Hitler, and the small band of Russian men and women who likewise perished for their part in the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881, each inhabited an utterly different moral universe to the *Jihadi*, who never targets as they did only the dictator and the despot, but randomly and indiscriminately massacres only ordinary civilians - men, women, children, babies - simply because they or their parents do not share the faith of their killer. Yet these common murderers are described by Corbyn as his 'friends' and by millions of Muslims who share their hatred of the Jews as

heroes and martyrs, while their families are financially rewarded and, if their haul of Jewish victims is large enough to warrant it, have schools and public spaces named after them by the Palestine Authority, the very same body that under the terms of the Oslo Accords, was charged with negotiating with Israel the 'two state solution' to the Palestine question. In the light of such blatant endorsement and even incitement of anti-Jewish terror, it might more appropriate, following the Nazi euphuism for the Holocaust, to call it the final solution to the Israel question.

Islamic terror such as this is grounded in the religion's theology, as here;

'One must go on *jihad* at least once a year...one may use a catapult against them when they [the infidels] are in a fortress *even if among them are women and children*. One may set fire to them and drown them.' (Al-Ghazali, circa 1058-1111 Islam's most respected scholar. Emphasis added.)

I invite the reader to, as they say, 'compare and contrast' the following statements on the role and scope of terror:

'Every martyrdom operation against any Israeli, is an Islamic commandment.' (Sheikh Muhammad Sayyed Tantawi of the Al Azhar University of Cairo)

Next, a senior Hamas commander, Fathi Hama, in July 2019 urging on Gazaeans to breach the frontier with Israel in a so-called 'march of return', a 'march' including not only 'women, children and teenagers' but concealed among them, Hamas gunmen. It was 'a legitimate act according to Islamic law', a 'return' to a country neither they nor their parents and in nearly case, grandparents had ever set foot in:

We must attack every Jew on the face of the earth, to slaughter and kill them with the help of Allah. All of the Palestinian people are prepared to explode. We built a suicide vest factory with thanks to God [and funding from the United Nations]. We are ready to breach the fence, our sisters are ready to carry the suicide vests on their way to Allah...you are all doomed to be killed, with God's help, you [sic] will all be killed by our [sic] suicide vests. [Hamad was not wearing one] ...We will distribute vests to anybody who wants one...We want you to wield your knives. They only cost five shekels each. How much does a Jew's throat need to cost us? Five shekels or less. Our men are ready to die and to breach the fence.

The voice of the religion of peace. Now the declaration by the People's Will, the terrorist organisation that had carried out the assassination of Alexander II. It concerned the assassination later the same year of US President James Garfield:

In a country in which the freedom of the individual allows an honest contest of ideas, where the will of the people determines not only the forms of law but the actual persons of the rulers [unlike in tsarist Russia] - in such a country political murder is an expression of the same despotic spirit which we feel it our duty to oppose in Russia. Despotism, whether of a person or a party, is always reprehensible, and violence is justifiable only when it is directed against violence.

As I said, two opposed moral universes. Yet there are those on the left who have chosen to side with the first against the second.

Finally, despite all the carnage, proof that Jihadi terror can have its lighter moments, as related with relish on YouTube by a London-based Shi'ite cleric, Abdallah Al-Khali, concerning a *fatwah* which appeared on the *Lions of Sunna* Internet Forum:

One Wahhabi wrote: 'Dear Sheik, may Allah grant you martyrdom, and black-eye virgins in paradise. I wanted to commit a martyrdom operation. I turned to Sheik Abu Dimaa Al-Qassab, who told me that they had invented a new and unprecedented form of martyrdom operations - explosive capsules are inserted into your anus. In order to train for this method of *Jihad*, you must consent to being sodomised for a period of time, so that your anus becomes wider, making room for the explosives. My question is whether I am permitted to allow one of the mujahideen access to my anus, if my intentions are honorable, and the purpose is to train for *Jihad* by widening my anus.' The sheik praised Allah and said: 'In principle, sodomy is forbidden. However, *Jihad* is more important. It is the pinnacle of Islam. If sodomy is the only way to reach this pinnacle of Islam, then there is no harm in it. The rule is that necessity makes the forbidden permissible...No duty takes precedence over Jihad. Therefore, you must be sodomised. After you have been sodomised, you must ask Allah for forgiveness.'

Sadly, the Allah-sanctioned sodomy came to naught. Wikipedia records that the bomber, Abdullah al-Asiri, a Saudi member of al-Qaeda, did manage to blow himself up, but only succeeded in inflicting minor injuries on his intended victim, the Saudi Minister of the Interior, Muhammed bin Nayef. Let us hope that even so, as a reward for his ingenuity and self-sacrifice, he still secured his (back) passage to paradise.

Prologue

‘Islam holds a place in our Western Societies. Islam belongs in Europe. I am not afraid to say that political [sic!] Islam should be part of the picture.’ Federica Mogherini, EU Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security [sic!] Policy, June 24, 2015.

‘Islam is definitely compatible with democracy.’ Beatrice Ask, Sweden’s former Conservative Minister of Justice.

‘Legislation is not but for Allah.’ *Koran*, 12: 40

‘Democracy is a man-made system meaning rule for the people. Thus, it is contrary to Islam, because rule is for Allah.’ Sheikh Muhammad Saalih al-Munajjid, *fatwah* 07166.

‘Democracy means the rule of the demos, the common people...In Islam, however, power belongs only to God...Islam is incompatible with democracy.’ Amir Taheri: *Islam and Democracy: The Impossible Union*, *Islam Daily*, July 24, 2004.

Jews and Islam...yes. Everybody knows, or should by now know, that for a number of reasons, one of which is of course the existence and policies of the state of Israel, the Jews are public enemy number one so far as the overwhelming majority of Muslims are concerned, and as we shall see, many make no secret of it, and some even act on it with murderous intent and results. But what is, and why, the ‘Sharia left’? What and why indeed. For most of modern history, say from the mid-19th century up until the fall of the Third Reich, and in fact on into the 1950s, if we exclude Islam, anti-Semitism was almost exclusively the prerogative of the the far, often fascist or Nazi right. The most extreme case is that of Julius Streicher, the Nazi’s champion Jew-baiter. Typical of his style is a speech he made to an anti-Semitic rally in Hamburg in 1935, in which, consciously or otherwise, he echoed the *Koran’s* description of the Jews with a tale of how the product of a union between a Jew and an ‘Aryan’ emerged from its mother’s womb as an ape. This proved to be too much to stomach even for members of his all-Nazi audience, some walking out in disgust. But as we shall see, for mainstream TV channels in the Middle East, especially but not only those of Jeremy Corbyn’s Hamas ‘friends’ in Gaza, and the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank, it is standard fare, not least for programmes specially produced for audiences as young as four years of age.

In addition to what we might term its modern, secular, pseudo-scientific versions, we have religiously-derived and in the case of Islam, also religiously-sustained anti-Semitism. Christian hatred of the Jews is as old as the faith itself, inscribed as it is in its founding text, and deriving from the myth of the Jewish deicide portrayed therein. It is still with us today, though much attenuated, either augmented or supplanted by the more modern versions of the old prejudice that appeared in the nineteenth century, which claimed to have discovered scientific and cultural as distinct from theological grounds for fearing, despising, persecuting and

finally exterminating the Jews. This trend found its ultimate genocidal expression in the race theories of the Nazis.

Finally, on the left, from time to time, voices could be heard, usually on the margins of the working-class movement and nearly always those of its radical intelligentsia, such as Georges Sorel in France and Eugen Dühring in Germany, which portrayed capitalism as the creation of the Jews, and which had to be combated accordingly, a delusion famously ridiculed by the founder and first leader of the German Social Democratic Party, August Bebel, as the 'socialism of fools', in so doing, providing this book with its title. Adopting the same approach, Frederick Engels saw anti-Semitism as the fruit of a 'retarded culture', serving 'reactionary ends under a purportedly socialist cloak', a 'degenerate form of feudal socialism' with which 'we can have nothing to do.' (As the reader progresses through this work, he or she will see evidence proving that this is no longer the case.) Rejected by all the authoritative socialists of the day, as a significant current, socialist anti-Semitism withered and nearly died as the movement matured, only to resurface on the extreme right as Hitler's genocidal 'National Socialism', which met its nemesis at the hands of the Allies in the Second World and the Nuremberg Trials. But still it refused to die.

Seven decades on, and for all Engels' strictures, it returned, now again on the left, in the form of what I call 'Sharia leftism' and its exponents, the 'Sharia left'. Disguised, often very crudely, and never completely, as anti-Zionism (which is itself a special kind of anti-Semitism), Sharia leftism operates on the assumption that a new radical movement can be assembled in the west on the basis of a shared opposition by leftists, diaspora Muslims, and Jihadist movements to the existence of the state of Israel and more generally to what it describes as 'western imperialism', in the first place that of the USA, irrespective of whether this hostility be political or, as in the case of Muslims, also religious and racist. To this end, single issue 'fronts' are created to draw together the various elements of this opposition to conduct political 'campaigns' which, while ostensibly independent, are effectively under the control of the Sharia left in its various manifestations.

In time-honoured Stalinist tradition, the names of the movements comprising these fronts have little if anything to with its real purpose. Thus, we have the 'Stop the War Coalition', founded by Corbyn, the ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and Kamal Majid, founder of the British Stalin Society, which is dominated by Sharia leftists and Muslims who support *Jihad* against Israel, and the similarly composed 'Unite Against Fascism', which has been accused by Human Rights campaigner Peter Tatchell of being 'silent about Islamic fascists who promote anti-Semitism'. Finally, under other similar hats, we have the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign (patron and founder, Corbyn) and the more extreme, and for that reason, secret website, Palestine Live, of which Corbyn was a (likewise secret) member from 2013 to 2015 Both provided anti-Israel platforms on which the Sharia left combined with all manner of anti-Semitic low life seeking to destroy the Jewish state. (See Appendix T)

I ask the reader to take cognisance of the following: Before becoming Leader of the Labour Party in September 2015, Corbyn was, uniquely, a prominent participant in all four movements as either as a founder, public speaker, facilitator or leading office-holder, in addition to his activities on behalf of pro-regime Cuban, Nicaraguan and Venezuelan 'Solidarity' Campaigns, and as both vice chair and vice president of the Campaign for (unilateral) Nuclear Disarmament. As such, Corbyn

was the lynch-pin of the Sharia left project, and for that reason, features more prominently in this work than any other of its main proponents. By way of an introduction to the *modus operandi* of the Sharia left, this is one of many examples of what I have termed its selective solidarity:

On October 10, 2015, two Islamic State suicide bombers massacred 128 Kurdish socialist and trade union activists at a pre-election rally in Ankara, Turkey. There was no Sharia left protest or demonstration of solidarity with the embattled Kurdish left at the Turkish embassy in London, since the Socialist (sic) Workers (sic) Party, which with Corbyn launched the Coalition, had derided the Kurds as 'western pawns'. Instead, the Stop the War Coalition mobilised its anti-Zionist army outside the Israeli Embassy in London in support of a series of Palestinian assassinations of Jewish civilians in Jerusalem, claiming on its website that 'even Gandhi [sic] would understand the reasons for this outburst of Palestinian violence'.

Reproduced below are statements made about the Jews and Israel by a range of individuals, nearly all of whom, irrespective of their backgrounds, can broadly be classified as either part of or fellow-travellers of the Sharia left:

'Solution for Israel-Palestine-Israel conflict: Relocate Israel into United States. Problem solved.' Naz Shah, Labour MP for Bradford West.

'When I visited Israel just for a week, I was stunned. It was a separation [of Palestinians] for the sake of extinction, of destruction and extermination.' Rev. Allan Boesak, anti-Zionist campaigner.

'Israel, we see your crimes and we loathe them. To us your nation does not exist because it is a criminal injustice against humanity.' Muslim convert and Iran's Press TV Presenter (with Corbyn) Lauren Booth, sister-in-law of former Prime Minister Tony Blair.

'The Israel lobby has just destroyed the Labour Party...It is an amazing achievement.' George Galloway, former Respect MP.

'Good riddance! The two-state solution for Palestinian-Israeli conflict is finally dead.' Omar Barghouti, founder of the Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions campaign, December 2003.

'[The Jews of Israel have done] things that that even Apartheid South Africa has not done.' Bishop Desmond Tutu.

'The majority of British Members of Parliament are members of the [non-existent] Friends of Israel Society. That's all you need to know. The policy of places like the BBC is actually made at the Israeli Embassy.' Lauren Booth again. (And so also said Corbyn.)

'Pro-Israeli Zionists are scattered at strategic points throughout the British establishment. The intensity of these attacks are [sic] at all levels, right down to the reporter. If you study the internal, the internecine warfare that goes on inside the Jewish community, it is vitriolic, it is dreadful, I mean, what chance [do] we have outside that community to stand up to this?' Tim Llewellyn, BBC correspondent.

'Israel and Mossad were directly involved in 9/11. The explosives were found in the Mossad agent's vehicle that was heading towards New York City.' 'Political activist' Ken O'Keefe.

'...what is happening is part of a massive project to manipulate public opinion against, and to destroy the popular progressive movement supporting Jeremy Corbyn...Corbyn represents a threat to the stranglehold the [Israeli Prime Minister] Netanyahu right-wing Israeli extremists have over the mainstream media coverage

of the oppressive Israeli occupation of the little left-over scraps of Palestine.’ Gail Bradbrook, Co-Founder of Extinction Rebellion. Bradbrook has re-cycled on her website Jewish conspiracy websites, including one featuring the notorious *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*.

And finally, by contrast:

‘What is anti-Zionism? It is the denial to the Jewish people of a fundamental right we justly claim for the people of Africa and all the other nations of the globe. It is discrimination against Jews, my friends, because they are Jews. In short, it is anti-Semitism...When people criticise Zionism, they mean Jews. Make no mistake about it.’ The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

Anti-Semitism...an attempt at a definition

‘The Jews are a spying nation.’ J.V. Stalin, December 1, 1952

‘It’s not anti-Semitic to hate the Jews of Israel.’ Ken Livingstone, addressing ‘Labour Against the Whitchhunt’, March 2019

Quite apart from any other deficiencies this work might contain, in view of its subject matter, it would substantially add to them if it did not establish at its outset what the author understands by the term ‘anti-Semitism’. In the interests of consistency, rather than rely on definitions offered by various sources, I provide my own. But first, a necessary clarification. Criticism of the Jewish religion, Judaism, is no more anti-Semitic (and therefore racist) than criticising Islam is to be racially prejudiced against Muslims, who are anyway defined not by their many races, but their religion. A large and increasing proportion of Jews are what is termed ‘non-observant’, while like Islam, Judaism also accepts converts, demonstrating in both cases that there is the need to make a clear distinction between race and faith. A critique of Judaism which is that and nothing more is therefore directed at a set of beliefs and the practises derived from them, not the biological or other characteristics of an individual or a group of people who say they believe in them. Neither is criticism of the policies and actions of the Israeli government anti-Semitic, unless it is based on flagrant falsehoods of the kinds I cite in this book, while ignoring, denying or justifying similar or worse actions and policies by other governments, or is motivated by hatred of Jews as such. That is what anti-Semitism is not. However, the belief that alone of the world’s 193 states, Israel has no right to exist is anti-Semitic, because those who advocate it judge the Jews and the state of Israel by criteria they apply to no other state or people. This view is held by not only hundreds of millions of Muslims, but many western leftists, including Jeremy Corbyn and his former shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, John McDonnell, who in turn share it with Neo-Nazis, a number of Arab regimes, the Iranian theocracy and three Islamic terrorist movements, Islamic *Jihad*, Hamas and Hezbollah.

The case of Corbyn is most illustrative in this respect, not least because after his election as Leader of Labour Party, his views on matters concerning Israel and the Jews became a subject of considerable public interest and for many, not only Jews, also concern. In his letter to Bishop Christopher Hill, written in defence of the anti-Israel activist and subsequently de-frocked anti-Semitic Anglican Vicar, the Reverend Stephen Sizer, whose attributing 9/11 to the Jews had been the prime reason for his de-frocking, Corbyn complained of the ‘demonising of those [like Sizer] who dare to stand up and speak out against Zionism, a philosophy that *precludes the existence of the state of Palestine.*’ (Emphasis added) This was a lie. Rather it was Corbyn’s ‘friends’ Hamas and Hezbollah who ‘preclude[d] the existence of the state of Israel’, by declaring in their charters their intention of destroying it. Moreover, it was the Zionist leadership who accepted the UN resolution of November 29, 1947, that established not only a Jewish state in the former British Mandate, but a Palestinian one, and it was all six UN Arab states who unanimously voted against it. Moreover, when their opposition to the resolution failed, these same Arab states launched their attack against Israel on the

first day of its existence, May 14, 1948. And when their military attempt to 'preclude the existence' of a state of the Jews also failed, Egypt and Jordan 'precluded the existence of a state of Palestine' by their illegal occupation of the territories allotted to it by the UN resolution, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank of the Jordan. In the same vein, Corbyn was at pains to stress in defence of Sizer who, as he must have known, subscribed to Jewish conspiracy theory, 'how much distance exists between anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism'. There is in fact, in almost every case, none. Sizer is a classic example of those who subscribe to both. The frequently invoked argument that anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism, but simply hostility towards certain policies of the Israeli government, is both dishonest and fallacious. Zionism is nothing more nor less than the conviction that like all other peoples, the Jews should have a nation state of their own. It necessarily follows that to be anti-Zionist is to alone of all peoples on this planet, deny Jews that right, an anti-Semitism compounded as often as not, as in the case of Corbyn, by supporting, however 'critically', Islamic terrorist movements that seek to make that denial a genocidal reality.

Holocaust denial belongs in the same category of anti-Semitism, since it is again racially selective, emanating from the same poisonous sources, with its claim that whereas other crimes against humanity have been committed, including a fictitious Jewish genocide of the Palestinians, the greatest of them all has been invented by the Jews to justify the creation and continued existence of the state of Israel. Likewise, there is only one conspiracy. No one on either the left or the right talks of a black conspiracy, or of a Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, Christian or Muslim plot to take over the world, even though conquest of the globe is the avowed aim of Islam. Neither is there a 'black lobby' or any other than that of Israel. Only the Jews, a people numbering no more than fifteen million, 0.2% of all humanity, are accused, now no longer only on the right but, as surveys of websites associated with and visited by Corbyn have revealed, also on the left, of conspiring to subject the remaining 99.8%, the more than seven billion non-Jewish inhabitants of this planet, to their tyrannical rule.

And by the same token, to claim, without a shred of evidence, that Israel has subverted British public institutions such as the BBC and the UK's educational system, as Corbyn has done, and that, to use Corbyn's very own words 'the 'hand of Israel' was behind a Jihadi attack against Egypt in 2012, is to talk the language of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, just as it is anti-Semitic to collectively accuse British Jews of being not truly British, at best of having their loyalties divided between the UK and Israel, and to compare policies and actions of the Israeli government, again as Corbyn has done, to those of the Nazis. To sum up, despite its many forms (and guises) *au fond*, anti-Semitism is the belief that there are qualities uniquely intrinsic to Jews, whether they subscribe to Judaism or not, that not only distinguish them from all other peoples, but are deleterious to non-Jews and gentile society in general and, being inherited biologically as well as culturally, are also ineradicable.

Anti-Semitism has its historical roots in the texts, history and practises of Christianity and Islam, and has endured in this theological form to this day. Despite his being crucified by the Romans, the death of Christ, so the Gospels tell us, was the wish and work of the 'perfidious Jews'. In his *Juifs devant l'Eglise et l'histoire*, published in 1897 with the approval of the Vatican, the Dominican theologian Pater Constant saw this alleged betrayal as proof that 'in the heart of every Jew there

flows a traitor's blood.' Like Jesus, Mohammed, as the *hadith* have it, also died at the hands of the same race, a female Jewish poisoner in revenge for his murder of her father, husband and uncle. In addition to the charges of deicide and propheticide, the Jews have been saddled down the ages with the so-called 'blood libel', as here by the professional French anti-Semite Eduard Drumont, whose diatribes against the Jews helped prepare the ground for the conviction in 1894 of the Jewish Captain Alfred Dreyfus on a fabricated charge of spying for Germany:

The Galician kikes with their curly forelocks, who, come together for some ritual murder, laugh with one another while, from the open wound of the victim their runs pure and crimson the Christian blood for the sweet bread of Purim.

Some Muslims even borrow from such Christian slanders against the Jews to supplement their own already rich arsenal of anti-Semitic invective, like the much admired by Corbyn Hamas leader, the fanatically anti-Semitic Sheikh Raed Salah: 'We are not the ones who allowed ourselves to eat a meal based on bread and cheese and soaked in Christian blood.' This is the very same Hamas preacher Labour MP Corbyn declared on Al Jazeera TV in 2012 he would 'look forward to giving you tea on the [House of Commons] terrace, because you deserve it', praised as 'an honoured citizen' with 'a voice that must be heard', and can be seen embracing him on a YouTube video. (See Chapter 14) In the west, modern anti-Semitism assumes both a theological and a secular form. Three examples must suffice here. According to his biographer, Jeremy Tredglown, in 1983, the children's writer Roald Dahl said to a *New Statesman* journalist

there is a trait in the Jewish character that does provoke animosity. I mean, there's always a reason why anti-everything crops up anywhere; even a stinker like Hitler didn't just pick on them [sic] for no reason.

On another occasion, Dahl insisted, like so many of his ilk, that he was 'not anti-Semitic' He was only 'anti-Israel'. Of course. Just like Corbyn and the Rev. Sizer, to name but two of many. Another 'celebrity', the actor Mel Gibson, belongs to a break-away fundamentalist Catholic sect, so his notorious anti-Semitism is no doubt at least partly rooted in theology: 'Fucking Jews...The Jews are responsible for all the wars in the world'. The third example is a posting by an exponent of world Jewish conspiracy theory and Holocaust denial, the twice-photographed with Corbyn, prominent Palestine Solidarity Campaign and BDS activist, and one of three administrators of the secret Palestine Live website, Tony Gratrex:

Jewish power is no longer a vague and mysterious concept. We should listen to the words of a few of the prime Elder Jewish oligarchs [an obvious allusion to the fraudulent *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*] and learn from them about the future of the Labour Party and its political role.

Then we have the version which relies in part upon pseudo-biology, a so-called race science. Nazi anti-Semitism, as defined in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, holds Jews to be subhuman, biological distinct from and inferior to not only 'Aryans' but to lesser humans, such as Slavs and those of black African origin. In this hierarchy of race, Hitler placed the Germanic peoples at the top, the unique creators of culture. Next came the rest of what he regarded biologically as humans, those only capable of

imitating what the Germans created. At the very bottom were the Jews, uniquely bent on cultural *destruction*, as Hitler explained in *Mein Kampf*

Was there any form of fifth or profligacy, particularly in cultural life, without at least one Jew involved in it? If you cut even cautiously into such an abscess, you found, like a maggot in a rotting body, often dazzled by the sudden light – a kike!

In order to protect Germanic culture from destruction by the Jews, it followed logically, and with the Holocaust, in practice, that the Jews themselves had to be destroyed. Demonstrating how today, the most extreme and undisguised Nazi-inspired anti-Semitism recognises no political boundaries, former Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn was for more two years a member of the already referred to secret website, *Palestine Live*, on which founder and chief administrator, Corbyn's close friend and Labour Party activist, Elleanne Green, posted, *approvingly*, a long quote from *Mein Kampf* attacking Zionism. (See Appendix T) Another member, Pam Arnold, posted the following:

Am reading *Mein Kampf*...Everybody should be forced [sic!] to read it, especially jews who have their own agenda as to why they are not liked.

This was the kind of political company Corbyn chose to keep...and, understandably, keep secret.

Islamic anti-Semitism, although unlike Hitler's in being totally rooted in theology, nevertheless has a close kinship with the Nazi version, since it too, in the *Koran*, describes the Jews as subhumans, specifically as 'apes and swine'. Contrary to the anti-Semite Livingstone's claim that Hitler 'supported Zionism', this affinity was, as we shall see (Chapter 6), the prime factor in bringing about Nazi-Muslim collaboration before and during the Second World War, and today, Neo-Nazi support for the Palestinian cause. Islamic anti-Semitism is often buttressed by references to that ur-text of Jew hatred, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, as for example in the 1988 Covenant of Jeremy Corbyn's 'friends' Hamas, and its various manifestations can be viewed on any number of TV channels emanating from the Arab Middle East.

In subscribing to the goal and ideal of the universal brother and sisterhood of humankind, the left, at least until the advent of its Sharia perversions, had been largely immune to the pestilence of anti-Semitism. But there have been exceptions. Perhaps the most notorious is that of Stalin, who not only in his immediate circle of cronies, but even in print, gave vent to his primitive prejudice, one which, in the last years of his rule, led to the unleashing of a state-sponsored pogrom against Soviet and East European Jewry, culminating in the so-called 'Jewish Doctors Plot' and the murder and hounding of Jews from Soviet public life. (See Appendix W) The occasion was a report he wrote for the Bolshevik journal *Bakinsky Proletary* on the proceedings of the Fifth Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, held in London in 1907, where Lenin's faction, much to the author's chagrin, found themselves outvoted by their Menshevik opponents, many, if not most, being Jews. Finding it 'interesting' [sic] that 'the majority of the Menshevik group were Jews', Stalin, with evident relish, related that one of the Bolshevik delegates 'observed in jest [sic] that the Mensheviks constituted a Jewish group while the

Bolsheviks constituted a true-Russian group and that therefore it wouldn't be a bad idea for us Bolsheviks to stage a pogrom in the party'. Three decades on, Stalin did just that. Numbered amongst his most prominent opponents and eventual victims were Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and Radek...each one of them a Jew.

The Socialism of Fools

1 Solidarity?

The outbreak, in the summer of 2014, of renewed warfare between Israel and Hamas unleashed torrents of international condemnation of Israel's response to years of perpetual rocket attacks and tunnel terrorism emanating from Gaza. Mass anti-Israel demonstrations in European cities often spilled over into attacks on synagogues, Jewish shops, businesses, individual Jews and rabbis, in outpourings of wild anti-Semitism not seen in Europe since the Nazi 'Crystal Night' pogrom of November 1938. Notorious neo-Nazis mingled with far leftists and Muslims in the London anti-Israel demonstration of July 26, 2014. One marcher carried a placard promoting the notorious anti-Jewish fabrication, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. Alongside Neo-Nazi activist Lady Michel Renouf also marched Jewish conspiracy theorist and Corbyn enthusiast James Thring, displaying a poster accusing the Jews of genocide, while another marcher held aloft a banner inscribed 'Save Gaza - Hitler Was Right'. Two other marchers were videoed and recorded chanting 'Heil Hitler'. In the words of one demonstrator, 'everybody [sic] is united against Israel'. And at the head of a march that for the first time in British history, had indeed brought together all points of the political compass, was a veteran anti-Israeli campaigner who, little more than a year later, would emerge from back-bench obscurity to become leader of the Labour Party and in doing so, act as the catalyst for the greatest moral crisis in its history.

On the continent, the same alignments unleashed onto the streets 1930s Germany-style rampaging mobs that targeted Jewish properties and places of worship. Again, Nazis rubbed shoulders with Muslims and leftists, chanting the same slogans of hate against Israel and the Jews. And since Israel was the common enemy, nobody seemed to take exception to their unaccustomed company. Jihadists marched with 'moderate' Muslims, assorted leftists, Nazis, Leninist groupuscules, pacifists and even liberals...anyone who saw in Israel and its Jewish population an object of hate. This convergence of the extremes of right and left re-enacted, this time on the streets of Europe, the Stalin-Hitler Pact of August 23, 1939, only now it was the Jews, not the Poles, who were the targets. In the wake of these outpourings of anti-Jewish hatreds, the rate of reported anti-Semitic incidents doubled in London, and by 53% nationwide. Even though the police must have known who was responsible, no-one commenting on these statistics felt able to suggest who the bulk of the perpetrators might be. So I will. Aside from a handful of Neo-Nazis, the rest were certain to have been almost all Muslims.

No such inhibitions were evident when Israeli Jews were held to be the guilty party for defending themselves from attacks by a movement that explicitly sought their nation's extinction and their own extermination. And yet those who claimed to be outraged by TV and press images of casualties suffered by Gazaeans women and children, whose homes and schools had been requisitioned by Hamas as rocket bases and armouries and used as human shields, had never been moved to similar protests when far greater sufferings had been inflicted on Muslims by their co-religionists, and only selectively when by non-Muslims. Four months later, on November 29, 2014, over a hundred Muslims were killed while at prayer when a suicide bomber blew up a mosque in northern Nigeria. Scores more were wounded. In one day, January 3, 2015, the Nigerian Islamic State affiliate, Boko Haram,

laid waste the entire town of Doron Baga, killing around 2,000 of its Muslim inhabitants, and kidnapping its girls and young women for sexual slavery. Yet after these atrocities, and countless others like them, the West's streets remained silent and its otherwise so easily outraged protesters invisible, the reason being that everyone knew that those responsible for the carnage were themselves Muslims, not Jews. The selective outrage displayed after each such atrocity by millions of Muslims worldwide, not to speak of their clergy, demonstrated time and again that they hated the Jews far more than they cared for the lives and well-being of those with whom they shared their faith. Two weeks after the Nigerian mosque massacre, it was followed by an even worse atrocity inflicted by Muslims on Muslims. On December 16, to the cry of 'God is Great', a Taliban suicide squad mowed down with machine guns 16 staff and 132 children at a school in Peshawar, Pakistan. Three teachers who tried to defend their pupils were, as a special punishment for defying the will of Allah, set alight and burned to death. Finally, on February 3, 2015, ISIS displayed to the world a video of a fellow Muslim, a Jordanian fighter pilot held as a hostage, being burned alive in a cage, having previously released videos of two Japanese hostages being beheaded. Had any of these atrocities been perpetrated by Jews, or anyone else except fellow Muslims for that matter, it would require very little effort of the imagination to visualise what the reaction from the 'Islamic community' and its leftist shadow would have been. But as the perpetrators, like their victims, were devotees of the religion of peace...not a whisper of protest.

February 2015 was not an especially busy month for the Jihadi carnage industry, yet a website that monitored their murderous, largely fratricidal activities recorded 1,977 deaths and 2,354 seriously wounded. In one typical week, the tally was 412 killed, 341 seriously wounded. In less than one week in March, the following atrocities were reported, all committed by Muslims, and nearly all on Muslims. First, on Wednesday, there was an assault on of all locations, a museum in Tunis, Tunisia, by an ISIS suicide squad, resulting in 21 dead, nearly of all them infidel tourists. This was followed on Friday by a suicide bomber attack on two mosques in Yemen that slaughtered at least 140 Shi'as at prayer and wounded hundreds more. The same day, 45 were killed in ISIS suicide bomber attacks on Kurds celebrating their New Year in the north Syria province of Hasakeh. Finally, again on Friday, in northern Nigeria, around 100 bodies were found in a mass grave after Boko Haram had been driven out of the town of Damasak by government troops. Many of the bodies were minus their heads, these having been removed, as befits a movement affiliated to ISIS, in accordance with the manner specified by the *Koran* in Chapter 8, Verse 13: 'I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Smite them above the necks and smite off all finger tips.'

Being prayer day, Friday has always been a favoured opportunity for Jihadis intent on slaughtering their brother Muslims, because as a result of their being packed together in the confines of a mosque, the impact of the suicide bomb's blast will almost certainly be far more devastating than in other favoured locations, such as market places and cafes. For Allah is wise as well as compassionate. But a market was the selected target when, on Friday, July 17, 2015, an Islamic State suicide bomber slaughtered more than 120 fellow (but enemy Shi'a) Muslims celebrating the end of Ramadan in the Iraqi town of Khan Bani Saad, 20 miles north east of Baghdad. This massacre was followed by two atrocities of special significance for the Sharia left in the light of the political and national identity of their victims,

when, first on July 20 and then on October, 10, 2015, Islamic State suicide bombers slaughtered a combined total of 160 Kurdish leftist and labour activists and wounded more than 350. The first attack came in the Turkish town of Surec, close to the border with Syria, leaving 32 dead and over a hundred injured. The meeting had been targeted in revenge for the eviction of Islamic State forces from the Syrian border city of Koban by Kurdish fighters, and because the socialist gathering had been convened to organise help for the rebuilding of the liberated city. The second massacre was unleashed by two suicide bombers at a rally convened in Ankara calling for peace between Turks and Kurds in the run up to Turkey's crucial parliamentary elections due on November 1. On this occasion, 128 Kurds were killed, and another 245 wounded. Again, both from the left, who were, supposedly, their comrades, and from Muslims, silence.

Keeping in mind who the victims of these atrocities were, and who were their perpetrators, let us recall two assessments of the role of Islam in world affairs made by the leading force of the anti-Zionist far left in the UK, the Socialist Workers Party. The first dates from September 2001, made in the wake of the Jihadist attack on the World Trade Centre. In the course of justifying the party's refusal to condemn the killing of 2,753 office workers by Muslim suicide pilots, it was claimed that by not sharing its support for the atrocity, the 'rest of the left' had displayed, quote, 'an undialectical [sic] understanding of religion in practice.' The second quotation, from the same source, dates from August 2014, and can be reasonably construed as an endorsement of a number of Jihadi movements then coming to the fore, including Hamas, al Shabaab, Boko Haram and ISIS: 'Militant Islamism cannot generally be described as reactionary'. That is poor consolation to the relatives of the victims of the 'militant Islamist' massacres of Surec and Ankara. But then, the Sharia left had little if any sympathy for the Kurdish cause. Being neither Arabs nor 'militantly Islamic', they were, as the SWP had it, 'western pawns', albeit secular and leftist ones. Kurds were being slaughtered in their hundreds by 'militant Islam', as they have been over the decades in their tens of thousands by their Arab, Turkish and Iranian oppressors, yet the once again, streets remained silent, because the victims were not Palestinians, and their murderers were not Jews.

This mounting catalogue of Muslim killings presents a picture of a faith that is totally at odds with the claims made by and for it that Islam is a (and even 'the') religion of peace. It is impossible (though many try) to reconcile these claims with evidence such as the findings of a survey conducted by the BBC (yes, the normally pro-Islam BBC) of deaths resulting from Islamic terrorism. In just one month, November 2014, the BBC counted 664 terrorist attacks that resulted in the deaths of 5,042 people, the overwhelming majority of whom were, as is usually the case with the religion of peace, Muslim civilians. Bear in mind, this tally is just for one month! It is also far in excess of the number of casualties, military as well as civilian, that Hamas claimed to have suffered in all its armed clashes with Israel, deaths which are frequently cited as proof of an Israel 'genocide' of the Palestinians. By any standards, these are truly horrendous statistics, levels of civilian casualties not witnessed since the end of the Second World War. But what is most extraordinary and disturbing of all is that they do not seem to horrify those who should be the most horrified. Campaigners, particularly the Sharia left and the various UK Muslim pressure groups, who have made the most noise and at times even commotion over what they claim is the persecution and even genocide of Muslims by Israel, proved time and again by their studied silence that this carnage

did not concern them in the least, even though almost all its victims were Muslims. The only plausible explanation of this indifference is that it is because their killers were also Muslims. (As we shall see, some on the far left have even devised convoluted arguments to justify supporting, 'critically' of course, those that were actually doing the killing.) Irrespective of how many Muslims are killed by fellow Muslims, the Sharia protest industry only springs into action when, as in the summer of 2014, Israel replies to provocations by Islamic Jihadis. Overnight, the deaths of Muslims will suddenly matter, no matter what the chain of events that led to them, and London streets will echo to chants of hate against Zionist baby killers. But just so long as only Muslims are killing Muslims, all will remain quiet.

The cynicism of the Sharia left should surprise no one who recalls that many of those who today embrace the cause of Islam were, in the 1990s, ranged on the side of Serbian rapists and so-called 'ethnic' but in reality, religious cleansers, Orthodox Christians hunting down and massacring the Muslims of Bosnia and Kosovo. Then, it was Muslims who were denounced by the SWP as being in the pay of western imperialism. Endorsing this stance, in 2004, Labour Leader to be Jeremy Corbyn was one of 21 MPs who backed a Commons motion denying that any Serbian war crimes had occurred, even though their victims were Muslims. The trouble was, they were the wrong sort of Muslims, having received, unlike the Russian-backed Serbs, military support from the wrong sort of imperialism. Such are the contortions the far left will perform when the occasion and the circumstances demand them. After all, did not Stalin sign a friendship treaty with Hitler after years of posing as an intransigent foe of fascism?

The scale of the cynicism is monumental. Just compare the indifference of Muslims to the murder of their co-religionists by fellow Muslims with the mayhem they unleashed as millions stage violent protests against a video or cartoon they had not seen, the reported burning of a *Koran* that never took place, or passages in a novel they had not and, because most Muslims are illiterate in their own languages, let alone European ones, probably could not have read. In the Danish cartoons protests alone, endorsed by Corbyn, 250 Muslims died and another 800 were wounded over images on a sheet of paper, of which the one deemed most 'offensive' had been fabricated by Muslim clerics and then added to the others for the express purpose of unleashing the protests. Naturally, this reaction, unlike Israel's to the murder of its civilians and rocket attacks by Hamas, was not condemned as 'disproportionate'.

As a general rule, the anti-Zionist left and its Muslim diaspora allies only swing into action when the allegedly innocent party is Muslim, and the guilty party is infidel and, preferably, Jewish. But not always, at least when Russia is involved, as in the three cases of the Serbian massacres of Muslims in the Balkans, the Russian genocide of the Chechen Muslims, and chemical bombing of Muslims in Syria, which Corbyn's Stop the War [sic] Coalition refused to condemn. The genuineness of the anti-Zionist left's concern for Muslims in general and Palestinians in particular can therefore be legitimately questioned when it can be turned on or off according to global geo-political alignments. It invites the suspicion that it is not so much concern for Muslims or Palestinians as hostility towards Israel and a more general opposition to what it calls 'western imperialism', the eastern version being beyond any such reproach, that is the prime motive determining its political orientation and driving its campaigns. In the course of this work, I provide evidence that this is indeed the case. As for the war

within Islam, the excuse for ignoring it could well be that since Muslims have been waging their fratricidal war, Sunni against Shi'a, virtually from their faith's inception in the seventh century, why make a fuss about it now? It only creates a distraction from the fight against their common enemy...Israel. After all, what are dynamited mosques, televised beheadings, stonings of women, crucifixions, massacres of school children, amputations, and kidnappings, forcible conversions, gang rapes, burnings and burials alive, compared with the crimes of Zionism?

Two more instances of what can be justly termed selective (or simulated) outrage arose from tensions between Hamas and its immediate Arab neighbours. Following the Egyptian-brokered cease fire between Hamas and Israel in 2014, Hamas was suspected of lending logistical support to its ally, the Muslim Brotherhood, in the latter's terrorist attacks on Egyptian forces in Sinai. Just like Israel, Egypt responded by closing its border with Gaza and set about destroying and flooding the tunnels, 521 in number, dug by Hamas for smuggling weapons into the Gaza Strip. Other measures, also unlike Israel's, included the demolition of hundreds of homes along the Gaza-Egyptian border and the forcible removal of thousands of Gaza Palestinians. Naturally, these actions passed virtually unreported in the western media, and totally unprotested by Muslim pressure groups and their Sharia leftist stooges. Meanwhile Hamas continued to dig its tunnels into Israel, breaking the truce brokered by Egypt. On January 25, 2016, one of these tunnels collapsed, killing seven al Qassam brigade members *en route* to a terrorist mission in Israel. Reporting the deaths, the Hamas Al-Aqsa TV channel saluted the 'martyrs' who died 'when they were going to prepare for fighting the enemy'. This proof of the continued and undisguised commitment of Hamas to the destruction of Israel also passed virtually unreported in the west, and certainly without any official condemnation. But rest assured that had Israel taken any military action to protect itself from such incursions, it would have been a different story.

When, in the spring of 2015, Sunni Saudi Arabia launched a series of air strikes against the Iranian-backed Shi'a Houthi offensive in Yemen, PA leaders saw the opportunity to persuade their (fellow Sunni) Arab allies to strike a similar blow against their Iranian and thus Shi'a-sponsored proxies in Gaza. At Friday prayers in Ramallah on March 27, PA President Mahmoud Abbas's political adviser, Mahmoud Habbash, rather belatedly it should be said, claimed that the coming to power of Hamas back in 2006 was 'a coup', and that 'those behind it should be hit with an iron fist'. Lacking the wherewithal to inflict such a blow himself, speaking at the 26th Arab League summit in Egypt the next day, the PA President in effect demanded an invasion of Gaza to depose Hamas, a policy not adopted by Israel in the Gaza conflicts of 2014 and 2021: 'I hope the Arab states carry on the same policy that they are in Yemen in the case of all Arab nations that suffer from internal conflicts, such as Palestine, Syria, Libya and Iraq'. On neither occasion did any protests ensue from the left or the pressure groups of the Muslim diaspora. Just as the Egyptian operation in Sinai against Hamas went largely unreported, with no media images of demolished Sinai homes, flooded illegal smuggling tunnels and deported families, so did Fatah's call for its crushing by the combined action of the Arab League. In fact, so far as the western media, the Palestinian protest industry, the UN and the world's politicians were concerned, there was neither anything untoward or of interest about Arab aggression towards Hamas, proving once again that it is not what is done, or even to whom, that is the issue, but who is doing it. As for the Fatah call for the invasion of Gaza, surely it was worthy of comment that

it was made, in the full knowledge of what its human costs would be, by the same politician who was pressing the UN to investigate war crimes allegedly committed by Israel during its conflict with Hamas in the summer of 2014.

Two of the many accusations made against Israel in the course of its 2014 war with Hamas were its use of excessive military force and the deliberate killing of Gaza civilians. For the sake of the argument that follows, let us grant both these accusations to be well-founded, even though no one making the first had been able to say what the correct level of force, if any, should have been or, as regards the second, explained why Hamas chose to increase the number of civilian deaths by forcing civilians to remain in combat areas when the option was available, given the advanced warnings by Israel of its impending operation, of moving them to places of relative safety. In the war then raging in Yemen between Shi'a forces backed by Iran and Sunnis by Saudi Arabia, in the nine months from January to September 2015, out of a total 5,239 recorded deaths caused by military action, 88%, were civilians, 60% being killed by air strikes. The number of civilian deaths was therefore more than double the total number of fatalities, military as well as civilian, which Hamas claimed the Israelis had caused in the Gaza war of 2014. So where were the protests? Why had the fatuously named Sharia left 'Stop the War' Coalition not poured onto the streets, as it did in the summer of 2014, and at the time of the removal of Saddam Hussein in 2003, to demand that this war be stopped? Why were there no demonstrations initiated by UK leaders of the Religion of Peace and supported by the Sharia left demanding an end to the Islamic civil wars raging in Syria, which by 2016 had resulted in the deaths of at least a quarter of a million civilians, nearly all of them Muslims? Like Black Lives when they not taken by police (See Appendix XI), do Arab lives come also cheap when no Jew can be blamed for their taking? Could it be that some wars need to be stopped more than others, especially when the latter involve fratricidal slaughter by rival factions and states of the Religion of Peace? Other wars again, or to give them their theologically correct name, *Jihads*, are to be positively encouraged, when the target is Israel or any western democracy.

These are just two of many examples of the double standards that are almost universally applied when judging the conduct of Israel, a bias that will prove to be a constantly recurring theme throughout this work. What government in the world would passively accept the firing of rockets and the digging of terrorist tunnels into its territory, and the kidnapping, hostage taking and murder of its civilians? Only Israel, it seems, is expected to tolerate it, by being denied the right to defend itself from such attacks and to choose the means to do so which, according to resolutions adopted by the UN, it has the right to do.

Consider the following sequence of events. Only weeks before the kidnapping and then murder of the three Israeli students, Hamas published, for the instruction of its Jihadis, an 18-page manual on kidnapping techniques, titled, *Guide for the Kidnapper* (sic!). The kidnappings duly followed on the night of June 12, 2014, followed in turn, on July 2, by the murder of a Palestinian by fanatical Israeli nationalists, a crime denounced in Israel even by the parents of the three murdered Jewish students. The three culprits were soon arrested, charged with murder and convicted. Two were sentenced, one to life, and the other to 21 years. The third awaited sentencing pending a decision by judges on his plea of insanity. Contrast this judicial response with the praise heaped by Hamas on the murderers of the Israeli students. A statement, issued in Istanbul on August 20 at a meeting of the

International Union of Islamic Scholars (sic) by Saleh al-Arouri of the military wing of Hamas, lauded the murders as an 'heroic operation', the 'exercise of the popular will throughout our occupied land'.

On July 3, Hamas began its rocket attacks on Israel, followed by Israel's military response, 'Protective Edge', on July 8, which was preceded by dropping leaflets warning Gaza civilians of the impending attack...hardly the action of an army bent on committing genocide. (Israel's IDF repeated such a warning prior to its invasion of Gaza following the Hamas pogrom of October 7, 2023. But this did not prevent the usuals claims of an Israeli genocide of the Palestinians.) In all, Hamas launched 4,501 rockets aimed indiscriminately at urban areas in Israel, and therefore also at civilians, a war crime as defined by international criminal law. Of these, 737 were intercepted by Israel's 'Iron Dome', while another 197 landed inside Gaza, killing 13 civilians, 11 of them children, not a ratio one would expect if they were in places of safety. The war began with Hamas deliberately killing Israeli civilians, yet it was only Israel that was accused of war crimes when it used legal military force against those responsible for these attacks. What would any government do if it came under such a bombardment? Would it risk domestic humiliation and the security of its people and borders by heeding advice from its enemies as to what should be its 'proportionate response'? Should it, for fear of being wrongly accused of committing war crimes, do nothing? What was also overlooked, or deliberately ignored, by Israel's critics and enemies was that even while the conflict still raged, a prominent Hamas leader publicly acknowledged that the murder of the three Israeli students was no random or freelance affair but was a deliberate and calculated provocation authorised by Hamas. On August 20, 2014, Hamas official Salah al-Nuri, speaking at the same Istanbul gathering, boasted that the murders, executed by 'your brothers in the al Qassem Brigade', were intended 'to ignite an intifada [uprising] in the West Bank and Jerusalem'. Again, one must ask...what sovereign state would tolerate such actions as these?

Double standards were also evident in the various campaigns to impose academic, cultural and economic boycotts of Israel. Not because Israel in any way imposes restrictions on intellectual or cultural life...far from it. It is the only state in the Middle East that permits the same kind of freedoms that in the west are, I would suggest foolishly, taken for granted, but in the Arab and Islamic worlds, are in very short supply, if they exist at all. It is this freedom that has enabled Israeli intellectual life to flourish to such an extent that it has placed the Jewish state in the very forefront of world culture and science, as evidenced by its vastly disproportionate share of Nobel Prizes. Is it perhaps because Israeli Arabs suffer restrictions in these areas that do not apply to Jews? Despite allegations of an Israeli 'apartheid', that is not the reason given for the boycotts, though if the allegations were true, such actions would indeed be justified. The boycott movement is, officially at least, primarily directed against Israel's presence in West Bank, with its population of 2.6 million Palestinians. That being so, why do not the same individuals and organisations which seek to impose boycotts on Israel for its occupation of the West Bank (but not Gaza, which it left in 2005) also demand similar punishments for China, which for decades has brutally suppressed the national aspirations of Tibet, and persecutes its own Muslims in Sinkiang province? Or Turkey, for its illegal invasion of Cyprus in 1974, and continued *de facto* occupation of the northern half of the island until now? The same can said for three states which today occupy territories wholly or mainly populated by Kurds: Iran, Syria and Turkey. (The 6.5

million Kurds in Iraq, thanks to the removal by western imperialism of the genocidal Saddam regime, now enjoy a degree of autonomy unique in their modern history.)

What we have here is best described as ‘selective solidarity’, which first emerged in the early years of the ‘Cold War and operated up to the collapse of the USSR in 1991. During that time, no demand was made even by the non-Stalinist left for the boycott of the Soviet Union for:

- 1) its illegal occupation up to August 1991 of the Baltic States, assigned to the Kremlin by the Stalin-Hitler Pact of August 23, 1939;
- 2) its repression of workers’ uprisings in East Germany in July 1953 and Hungary in November 1956, and the invasion and occupation in August 1968 of Czechoslovakia to suppress its ‘socialism with a human face’;
- 3) the invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979;
- 4) its murder, imprisonment and hounding of Soviet critics of its Kremlin regime, human rights activists, trade unionists, artists and writers, and the denial of the right of Jews to emigrate;
- 5) Its denial of national independence to its numerous ethnic minorities.

Not one of these actions was deemed worthy of a boycott of the regime that was committing them. But Israel’s uniquely are. Why is there no call for a boycott of the United Kingdom, which not only Irish nationalists of various hues but also many on the British left, including former Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn, believe illegally occupies Northern Ireland as a consequence of the imposition of the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 by threats of military force? Scottish and Welsh nationalists likewise oppose rule, albeit devolved, from Westminster. The same could be said of the UK’s possession of the Falkland Islands, which once again, most on the far left believe should belong to Argentina, and who in the war of 1982, supported the Argentinean Junta’s invasion. Then there is the claim of Spain to sovereignty over Gibraltar. True, short of emigrating, it is difficult to see just how UK leftists could operate a boycott of their own country, but what they certainly could do is to demand that their overseas counterparts do so instead. However, no such obstacles prevent UK leftists from promoting in its turn a boycott of Spain, whose successive governments since the end of the Franco regime in 1975 have turned a deaf ear to Basque and Catalan demands for independence. Why no boycott of Denmark for its colonial rule over Greenland? And why no boycott of the Great Satan itself for its ‘occupation’ of Puerto Rico, Guam, the North Marianas and its Cuban base at Guantanamo? Then there is France, with its numerous overseas possessions, which account for 4.1% of the republic’s population. Beginning at the top with Corbyn, the Sharia left resolutely opposes any boycotts and sanctions aimed at Putin’s war crimes in Syria and his flagrant violations of the sovereignty of Ukraine, and likewise, any western military supplies to those resisting it. Indeed, Corbyn has praised Putin for ‘dari[ing] to resist this US Empire, taking a stand against the hypocrisy, double standards [sic] and complete lack of respect for other countries.’ Putin’s ‘lack of respect’ for the sovereignty of nations bordering his own country is of course a different matter.

Perhaps strangest of all, there is that part of partitioned Kashmir under Indian rule claimed by Pakistan, with its nine million Muslims, more than three times the number of Palestinians in the West Bank. Yet there is no call for a boycott of India.

For more than two years, the Islamic State occupied and imposed a reign of religious terror on vast swathes of Syria and Iraq but this too failed to provoke a single protest or demonstration by the Sharia left and its Muslim allies. There have been no Sharia left protests outside the London embassies of China and Myanmar for their regimes' persecution of Muslim minorities numbering millions, or those of Turkey, Syria, Iraq and Iran for their denial of independence to ten times as many Kurds as the number of Palestinians in the West Bank. All told across the world, there are currently approximately 170 territories whose occupation is disputed. But of these 170, only one, the West Bank, a territory over which, unlike all the others, Israel does not claim sovereignty, is of concern to the left. Do not these flagrant instances of leftist double standards warrant the investigation of the possibility that anti-Semitic prejudices have contributed to the fact that of all the injustices that we see in the world today, only those attributed to Israel, correctly or otherwise, are deemed worthy of street demonstrations and a boycott campaign? And was it not the height of hypocrisy that one prominent supporter of this campaign, the cosmologist Stephen Hawking, was himself the beneficiary of an Israeli-made synthetic voice machine?

In the Middle East, the only region in the world in which for at least two decades, the far left has taken an active interest, Kurds have been slaughtered in their tens of thousands by their oppressors, but there has at no time been a call for a boycott of those regimes doing the killing. On the contrary, one of the chief culprits, Iran, despite its appalling human rights record, has been given a free ride by its supporters in the UK, in the first place the Sharia leftist Socialist [sic] Workers [sic] Party and Labour MP and from September 2015 to April 2020, Labour Party Leader Jeremy Corbyn, who was previously a highly-paid broadcaster on the Iranian state TV channel, Press TV. It was the same story in relation to Iraq. In 2003, with the US-led invasion looming, demonstrations by the SWP's 'Stop the War Coalition', chaired by the ubiquitous Corbyn, had as their sole purpose the preservation of the fascist Ba'ath regime of Saddam Hussein, despite the strong competition, undoubtedly the worst butcher of the Kurds. The Coalition had been launched only a matter of days after 9/11, in response to US President George Bush's declared intention to remove from power the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, which had been hosting the architect of 9/11, the Al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden. Having failed to prevent the overthrow of the Taliban theocracy, the Coalition turned its attentions to the task of saving Saddam Hussein from the same fate. Opposition to the removal of Saddam ranged across the full political spectrum, from the SWP on the far left through to the Neo-Nazi British National Party on the extreme right, and in between, a host of clerics, including the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury. In the run-up to the Coalition's largest London demonstration, the true-blue *Daily Mail* even thoughtfully supplied a map of the route and contact details of the march's organisers. The *Mail's* unusually supportive attitude can at least be partly explained by the results of a Mori poll conducted shortly before the invasion, which found that while most Tory voters opposed UK military involvement in the removal of Saddam Hussein, the reverse was the case for Labour voters.

There are other notable instances in the past where repressive policies directed at certain nations have not led to demands for boycotts. Irish nationalists of various persuasions have never accepted the legality of the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921. Imposed by *force majeure*, it conceded home rule to the overwhelmingly Roman

Catholic 26 counties of the south but preserved British rule in the mainly Protestant six counties of what became and still is the province of Northern Ireland. But even at the height of the 'Troubles', when Northern Ireland was under a *de facto* British military occupation and ruled directly from Westminster, Irish nationalists, even those engaged in armed struggle against British rule, did not call for a boycott of Britain in any way analogous to that today imposed on Israel, nor was there any suggestion by the British left that they should do so. There are Irish Senators who, though they insist that the UK is illegally occupying six of the nine counties of Ulster, nevertheless fear that Brexit will jeopardise the republic's many trade links with Northern Ireland, including the importation of products produced by British and Six County, Protestant-owned companies. But there are occupations and occupations, because the same Senators voted in 2018 to ban the importing of products made by Jewish settlers in the West Bank, over which Israel, unlike the UK over Northern Ireland, does not claim sovereignty.

Even when we come to the misdeeds of the Great Satan himself, it is the same story. Those active on the far left today who took part in protests against the US military operations in Vietnam and Cambodia (I was one) will recall, if their sometimes-selective memories permit, that even after the exposure of a number of atrocities committed by US armed forces, there was no call for a boycott of the United States, be it cultural, sporting, academic, economic or diplomatic. So again, the question...Why only Israel? In the case of China, there is an added reason to impose a boycott quite apart from the human rights abuses it has committed in Tibet and Xin Kiang. Unlike the USA, the UK and Israel, but like all Islamic states, China's internal regime permits no political, cultural or academic freedoms, and routinely harasses and jails those who criticise its repressive political system in any way. And surely we have not forgotten the bloody suppression of the 1989 protests in Tiananmen Square. And yet the flesh pots of a now booming capitalist China have proved irresistible to artists, musicians, sportsmen and women, politicians, the media, businessmen and academics alike, to the extent that in the unlikely event of a call being made to boycott China, one suspects it would fall on deaf ears, the excuse being that at all costs, the west must expand and strengthen its links with this emerging economic giant. The same considerations applied to Russia's illegal invasion and occupation and in the case of the Crimea and the Donbas, annexation, of Ukrainian, Moldavian and Georgian territories. Here too, no one on the left talked of a boycott. And when sanctions were imposed on Russia for its invasion of Ukraine on February 24, 2022, the far left, together with many on the far right, opposed it. Indeed, some, like the Green Party and Jeremy Corbyn, see Putin not as an invader, but as the victim of western 'encirclement'. (See Appendix XIV) I leave it to readers to decide for themselves why in all these cases where boycott campaigns could have been initiated, in only one instance has this occurred, when the state in question was Jewish.

Occupations apart, in addition to China, there are scores of regimes worthy of boycott campaigns purely on the grounds of their domestic human rights abuses, as was the case during South Africa's apartheid era. The difficulty here for the left is that a substantial number of such regimes are Islamic or resolutely anti-western. There is no boycott campaign targeting regimes that deny equality to women, for example. Perhaps our feminists can explain why. The same applies to regimes, again, mostly Islamic, that carry out or permit the persecution and even murder of gays, labour activists, secularists, apostates, religious minorities and atheists.

Those involved in the anti-Israel boycott movement must be perfectly aware who these regimes are, what they do and why they do it. Yet the only boycott campaign they are prepared to support is one directed against a democratic, secular state that upholds the equality of women, and the rights of labour, gays, ethnic and religious minorities and atheists.

The only reasonable conclusion one can draw from this selectivity is that the BDS campaign is not motivated by a concern for human rights, but an obsessional hostility towards the state of Israel and in some case for sure, a hatred of Jews. Neither is this campaign what it seems and claims to be. Those who have been ill-informed or gullible enough to endorse its activities should be made aware that they are involved, one hopes without their approval, in an operation that goes far beyond its stated official objectives. There is first of all the BDS chant, 'From the River [Jordan] to [the Mediterranean] Sea, Palestine shall be free.' And BDS founder Omar Boarghouti clearly had in mind something far more radical than changing Israeli policies when he confirmed that 'we oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine'. This stance was endorsed by Californian State University Professor As'ad Abukhali, who unlike those who, for tactical reasons, wanted to peddle a softer line, insisted that 'the real aim of BDS is to bring down the state of Israel. That should be stated as an unambiguous goal.' Who exactly was this 'we' referred to by Boarghouti? Surely those BDS supporters who do not endorse this 'real aim' of elimination of the state of Israel should make it their business to find out if it is supposed to include themselves. They should also ask how it came to be that in boycotting all things Israeli, they have joined forces with the US Nazi White Nationalist Party, which also campaigns for a total boycott of Israeli goods, and has even adopted the BDS logo as its own, with its red line through an Israeli flag, and why BDS supporters picketing, Nazi fashion, Marks and Spencer stores were joined by the openly anti-Semitic and Holocaust-denying Muslim Public Affairs Committee. Undeniably, anti-Zionists are all too prone to find themselves swimming in far right water, as the Nazi Combat 18 understood only too well: 'These are people who, due to the actions of Israel, are already avowed "anti-Zionists". All they need is a good solid argument to push them over the edge into full anti-Semitism.' Some, as we shall see, do not need pushing.

The ultimate in BDS hypocrisy and double standards was achieved when in June 2015, 40 directors, actors and other personalities from the UK film industry jointly demanded a boycott of Seret, the annual London Israeli and Television Festival. The grounds for the boycott had nothing to do with the status or content of cinema or TV in Israel. There was no claim that they were in any way subject to censorship, unlike regimes supported by some of those who endorsed the protest, or that Arabs were barred from employment in those industries. No, the pretext for the boycott was Israel's 'systematic violation of Palestinian human rights' and its 'wanton destruction and killing' during the Hamas-Israel conflict of 2014. Even if these charges were true, and they are not, the question remains, why do such individuals only advertise their concern for human rights when they have been allegedly violated by Israel? Why are there no protests when international festivals show films from countries where there is not only a proven 'systematic violation of human rights' but where the film makers and actors themselves are subject to censorship and government persecution? There were no similar protests when the famed Iranian film maker Pegah Ahangari was twice arrested after participating in the brutally suppressed massive anti-regime demonstrations of 2011, at a time when

Corbyn was employed by Iran's Press TV. But then, the theocracy which arrested Ahangari had declared its intention of 'wiping Israel off the map.' In the larger scheme of things, the arrest of one fellow film maker weighs very little if indeed anything when the jailer is fighting the good fight against Zionism.

Perhaps the greatest triumph for BDS came when, in August 2015, the Iranian ayatollahs, already emboldened by the capitulation of the west to the continuation of their nuclear programme, banned the world-famous Israeli musician Daniel Barenboim from entering their county to conduct a concert in Tehran by his Berlin StaatsKappelle orchestra. For many years, Barenboim had done more than anyone to build cultural bridges between Israeli Jews and Arabs with his West-East Divan Orchestra, composed of highly talented young Arab and Israeli Jewish musicians. Though not involved in party politics, he had on occasion been rightly critical of the Israeli government's Palestinian policies and been frequently attacked by the Israeli right as insufficiently loyal to the Zionist cause. None of this counted with the Iranian theocrats. Justifying the ban, a Cultural (sic) Ministry official explained that 'Iran does not recognise the Zionist regime and will not work together with artists of this regime'.

For the best part of two centuries, what is usually known as the 'right of nations to self-determination' has traditionally been prominent in the programmes of left-wing movements and is rightly invoked today to justify support for the creation of a fully independent Palestinian state in the Middle East. Though many on the left would have us believe otherwise, this also happens to be the official position of the Israeli government, enshrined in the 'Oslo Accords' agreement with the Palestinian Liberation Organisation in 1993. However, matters are not so simple. In their advocacy of the right of nations to self-determination, many on the left are, as we shall see, not entirely consistent. The left...and here we have in mind what can be called the 'far left'...has given its approval, for what it is worth, to a wide range of national movements, some of which have been anything but far left, and have employed methods that most on the far left explicitly reject in pursuit of their own goals. Over the years, this has included support for the Irish IRA, the Basque ETA, the Vietnamese NLF, the Algerian FLN, and a variety of similar, mainly third world movements. In each case, the support given was not for the methods used, or for the political and economic systems which such movements sought to establish after achieving independence, but for the right of a people to its own independent state. Nothing more, nothing less...just like Zionism, only in the case of the Jews, different criteria apply. Excluding for the moment the special case of Israel, there have been several occasions on which this principle, for purely opportunist reasons, has not been applied as one might expect, perhaps the most spectacular being the Falklands War of 1982. When the Argentinean military junta invaded and briefly occupied the Falkland Islands in April 1982, in the ensuing conflict, the majority of the far left rallied to the side of the far-right military dictatorship of General Galtieri, hoping for its victory over the UK Task Force dispatched to liberate the islanders. The case for this stance rested on two propositions; firstly that the Falklands morally, if not legally, belonged to Argentina, and that their seizure by the Junta was therefore a legitimate act of national liberation of an imperialist-occupied territory; and secondly, more generally, that it was the duty of the left to follow the policy, first defined and applied in the First World by Lenin, of 'revolutionary defeatism', which obliged revolutionaries not only to refuse support for 'one's own' imperialism in any armed conflict with a rival power, but that in Lenin's own words, 'in the

interest of the world revolution, workers must wish the defeat of their own government’.

As we shall see, Leninist defeatism, in its various guises, has served as the default position in the anti-western campaigning of the far left in its support for various Jihadi movements and Islamic regimes. However, when it was applied to the Falklands war, what this stance glossed over was that in this case, Argentina was the imperialist invader, and therefore those that advocated the application of orthodox Leninist defeatism were either obliged to ignore or dismiss as irrelevant the well-known facts that not a single Argentinean lived on the islands, or had ever done so, that population of the Falklands was of British origin, regarded itself as such, and eagerly awaited their liberation by the UK's armed forces. Others on the left, while refusing to approve of the invasion and occupation by the Junta, could not bring themselves to take the final logical step of supporting the only action that could effect the liberation of the Falklands, namely military action by Britain. This policy, or rather lack of one, replicated that of Second World pacifists and far leftists who deplored the crimes and conquests of the Third Reich, but were no less opposed to the only means that could bring about Hitler's downfall...military action by the Allies. Whatever the various factions of the left said at the time concerning the invasion of the Falklands, according even to their own definition of the right of a people to self-determination, it was Argentina that was violating the national rights of the Falklanders, and the UK that was restoring them. The Falklanders did not want to be Argentineans, but to stay British, and during the brief military occupation of their homeland, not a single inhabitant of the islands could be found to say otherwise. Even more perversely, prior to the invasion, the far left had unanimously denounced and campaigned against the Argentine Junta for what it was, a typical Latin American Vatican and US-backed military dictatorship with fascist undertones, one that since its instillation after an army coup in 1976, had waged its aptly-named 'dirty war', 'disappearing' as many as 30,000 thousand left wing and trade union opponents.

The political character of the regime revealed itself, as all of their kind inevitably do, even within the ranks of those entrusted with the power to rule over everybody else. In a series of legal cases pursued in Argentina's courts after the fall of the Junta, Jewish veterans of the Falklands war accused their Nazi-sympathising commanding officers of singling them out for humiliating punishments, tortures and even sexual abuse. When this quasi-fascist army invaded the Falklands, overnight, all the crimes of its officers against their own people were either forgotten or forgiven by the far left. In a somersault reminiscent of the Comintern's about turn after the conclusion of the Stalin-Hitler Pact in August 1939, from being castigated as a brutal oppressor and puppet of the CIA, General Galtieri was transformed overnight into an anti-imperialist warrior. Had a similar territorial dispute, only between the UK and Chile, led to the same sequence of events, we can be sure that just like his counterpart in Argentina (and later Saddam in Iraq) the result would have been the same. General Pinochet would, much no doubt to his bemusement, have found himself likewise transformed from a fascist butcher of the Chilean working class (which he was) and creature of the CIA (also true) into a heroic foe of British imperialism. In that event, the name and role of the leftist Chile Solidarity Campaign would have taken on a new meaning identical to that of the pro-regime Cuban, Nicaraguan and Venezuelan Solidarity Campaigns promoted by Jeremy Corbyn. The crowning irony of this extraordinary episode came in June

1982 after the expulsion of the 'liberators' from the Falklands. Having played his last card and lost in a desperate bid to cling onto power, not even a hastily arranged papal visit by Jean Paul II could save Galtieri. Hopelessly isolated, the discredited general resigned, and following Argentina's first free election since 1973, army rule was replaced by a democracy that has endured to this day. The 'disappearings' ceased, and the quest for justice for the Junta's victims began. Only the victory of 'British imperialism' over the Junta made all this possible. Quite apart from the fate of the Falklanders themselves, about which the left cared not at all, if, as it hoped, Galtieri's invasion had succeeded, the kidnappings, tortures and killings of their leftist Argentinean comrades would have continued.

The invasion and annexation of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein in August 1990 produced exactly the same classic Stalinist-style somersaults as Galtieri's invasion and annexation of the Falklands, and for the same reason. Prior to the invasion, Saddam's fascist Ba'athist regime, with its 75 Presidential palaces and network of underground torture chambers (See Addenda to Appendix T), had been opposed with near-unanimity by the left for its genocidal war against the Kurds (around 100,000 killed), its repression of trade unionists and leftists, and not least for provoking a fruitless eight-year war with Iran that cost a million dead. But all that changed on the day that Saddam's tanks rolled unopposed into Kuwait City and the United Nations, after much deliberation, resolved to remove Saddam by military means if all others failed. Overnight, Saddam the CIA stooge and genocidal butcher was transformed, like Galtieri, into Saddam the defiant foe of western imperialism, with the Kuwaitis playing the same role as the Falklanders as the beneficiaries of an unsolicited anti-imperialist liberation, a stance captured perfectly by more than one leftist group's slogan of 'Victory to Iraq' (for 'Iraq' read Saddam).

This was another example amongst the many we will encounter of leftist double standards. Among those who denounced Israel for its occupation of the West Bank were some who at the time, had no objections to Saddam's invasion, occupation and, unlike the West Bank, illegal annexation, of a member state of the United Nations, one, moreover, also populated by Palestinian as well as Kuwaiti Arabs. Compounding their plight, PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat's support for the invasion potentially transformed Kuwait's 400,000-strong Palestinian community into Saddam's fifth column, resulting in their persecution after Kuwait's liberation and then mass migration to Jordan, one instance of many in which the Palestinians have been and still are betrayed and manipulated by those who claim to be their saviours.

Time and again, leftist policy reversals have found intelligent, often well-educated and politically informed people performing, literally overnight, such spectacular ideological gymnastics, the classic case being those occasioned by the Stalin-Hitler pact of August 23, 1939. (See Appendix VIII) As an example of the summersault performed by the far left at the time of Saddam's invasion of Kuwait, I give you that executed by my parents-in-law. They were dyed-in-the-wool Communist Party loyalists and, as well-trained Stalinists, ever-ready and willing to march for or against whatever, as and when required. So, in the years leading up to the invasion of Kuwait, when it was US policy to support Ba'athist Iraq against the Iranian Ayatollahs, they had marched through the streets of their native Cardiff with party comrades and exiled Iraqis to protest the torture and murder of Iraqi leftists by Saddam's East German-trained secret police. Come Saddam's seizure of Kuwait, they were back on the same streets, only this time, to oppose any attempt by the western powers to remove the torturers and executioners of their comrades.

The previous marches, and their purpose, had been cast into the 'memory hole' of the Kremlin's Ministry of Truth. Saddam, the murderer of communists, the stooge of the CIA, was not only now the foe and innocent victim of imperialist aggression. *He always had been.* 'Comrades, the future is certain. It is the past that keeps changing.' In the event, the degree of loyalty to his embattled regime, both in 1991 and 2003, increased in direct proportion to the distance from Baghdad as throughout the west, 'anti-war' leftists and diaspora Muslims demonstrated their support for the fourth largest army in the world, while in the sands of Iraq, Saddam's press-ganged warriors mutinied, deserted or surrendered in their hundreds of thousands to the US task force.

Class in its various manifestations has traditionally been integral to the far left's approach to all political issues. But over the last two decades at least, it has been progressively subverted and supplanted, in the West by 'identity politics' (mainly of race but more recently also of gender and sexuality), and globally, by a counterposing of East to West, what Islam refers to as the *Dar as-Salam*, the House of Submission, where the law of Allah rules, and *Dar al-Karb*, the House of War, the still to be conquered lands of the infidel, where the Sharia left functions as Allah's secular Fifth Column or Trojan Horse.. The result has been the ranging of the bulk of the far left on the side of the most oppressive regimes and movements in and beyond the Muslim world, and against the masses they oppress politically, exploit economically, and manipulate mentally by directing their frustrations and hatreds against the West in general and the Jews in particular. Instead of exposing this time-honoured diversionary strategy, the Sharia left not only echoes it, but as we shall see, adds its own embellishments for western consumption. What it calls international solidarity in effect boils down to acting as propagandists for Muslim billionaires, obscurantist clerics, Hitler-worshipping assassins, mass murderers and genocidal Jew-baiters. So much for 'speaking truth to power',

Another aspect of the far left's selective, and therefore bogus internationalism is its ambiguous attitude to what is generally called 'regime change' when effected or assisted by external forces. US-led operations in Iraq and Afghanistan to establish at least pluralist, if not properly democratic political systems, were roundly denounced by the far left as acts of wanton imperialist aggression, though with regard to Afghanistan there was much confusion as to motive, in that unlike Iraq, the country's total lack of oil reserves, but also of any other natural resource or strategic value, far from bringing any gains to west, over-extended its military commitments. To further confuse matters, some of those on the far left who opposed the west's attempt at regime change in Afghanistan had supported the country's invasion and occupation by the Soviet Union in 1979, when on this occasion, the objective was regime preservation.

Not all 'regime change' was to be opposed however. It depended on who was doing the changing, what was being changed and from what into what. As we have noted, regime-changing invasions of Kuwait by Saddam and the Falklands by Galtieri to impose respectively fascist and military regimes were applauded as blows against western imperialism. The external agency of change need not always be military force. The boycott of South Africa, a broad campaign that operated largely outside the control of the far left, was also intended to bring about regime change, and greatly contributed to the ending of the apartheid system. Although policy rather than regime change is the stated official, though not actual, objective

of the far left-driven anti-Israel campaign, Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions, as we have seen, and will see again, there is another agenda that goes far beyond not only policy or even regime change, namely the elimination of an entire nation. But even Arab Muslim states can be swallowed up with leftist approval if the alignment of forces so dictates. It was opposition to the western military action in response to Saddam's invasion *and annexation* of Kuwait in August 1990 that brought onto the streets for the first time the *ad hoc* alliance between Muslims and what would in time evolve into the Sharia left. With the advantage of hindsight, it can be seen now that this coming together of the 'anti-imperialist' left with a Muslim movement that was motivated largely by Islam was the prelude to an official merging of their respective forces consummated when the Sharia left set in motion its 'Stop the War Coalition' to save the Taliban theocracy in Afghanistan and Saddam's blood-soaked tyranny from removal in 2001 and 2003 respectively. This became an alignment that, as we shall see, was conducted on the basis of an agenda increasingly set by Islam, not secular leftism

These inconsistencies in the attitude of the far left towards national liberation and military or fascist dictatorship help to shed light on its unrelenting hostility towards Israel. What determined its response to the Argentinian junta's Falklands invasion was not who carried it out or why (it was patently a chauvinist diversion from troubles at home) but the fact that the population of the islands was of British origin and loyalty, and that the government that liberated the Falklanders from Junta occupation was that of Tory Prime Minister Thatcher. Other factors than the justice of the specific case determined the stance of the far left, which was and still is driven by its intrinsic anti-westernism. This is nowhere better illustrated than in its attitude towards Israel. In this case we have the reverse of the Falklands because here the justice or otherwise of Israel's right to exist is determined by those who oppose it, the supposedly 'progressive' forces of Arab nationalism and Islamic Jihadism. This had led to a situation where in the judgement of nearly all the far left, only one people today does not qualify for the right to self-determination: the Jews. (The SWP extends this to the Kurds who, because their struggle for national independence has been directed against anti-western regimes in Syria, Iraq and Iran, it describes as 'western pawns'.)

Following the precedent, insofar as they are aware of it, set by the majority of Russian Marxists more than a century ago, with the exception of a very small minority, the far left insists that the Jews are not a people, and therefore that they have no right to their own independent state, however small, whatever its boundaries might be. Hence the implacable, even fanatical opposition to Zionism, which it depicts a racist, 'colonial-settler enterprise'. Unlike states that do answer to this description (Jews do not, having been, for at least 3,000 years, the indigenous people of what is now Israel) - for example Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the USA, not to speak of all the states of Latin America, it is only Israel that must simply disappear. How this is to be done, what is to replace it, and what is to be the fate of Israel's seven million Jews, is rarely spoken of in precise terms by the Sharia Left, and with good reason, because the Hamas Covenant makes no bones about it. Not only is Israel to be eliminated, with its territory incorporated in a Palestinian state 'from the River [Jordan] to the [Mediterranean Sea]'. *So are all its Jews*. (See Article Seven.)

To the world at large, the Palestinian Authority that (mis)represents the Palestinians of the West Bank and, until the Hamas takeover in 2006, the Gaza Strip,

presents a moderate face. It has little choice, having agreed, in undertakings given in the Oslo Accords of 1993, to work towards a 'two state' solution. But there are good reasons to doubt whether this is its intention. As far as Palestinian negotiators were concerned, the Oslo Accords were intended to serve as stepping stones to the eventual elimination of the state of Israel, as subsequent statements by PA and PLO officials made clear. On January 30, 1996, PLO Chairman Arafat revealed to a private gathering of Arab diplomats in Stockholm that 'we plan to eliminate the state of Israel and establish a purely Palestinian state. I have no use for Jews; [because] they are and will remain Jews'. This has remained the objective of the PLO, Fatah, and, from the first day of its creation, the Palestinian Authority. On January 4, 1998, PA Minister Abdul Aziz Shaheen made clear, this time in a newspaper article, that 'the Oslo Accord was a preface to the Palestinian Authority, and the Palestinian Authority will be a preface for the Palestinian state, which will in turn be the preface for the liberation of the entire Palestinian land.' On December 12, 2014 Mahmoud Al Habbash, advisor on Islamic Affairs to PA President Mahmoud Abbas, declared that 'all our occupied land will return to us, even if it takes time.' In the final analysis, whatever negotiations that might be conducted or agreements reached on the Palestinian question, they count for nothing, because as Al Habbash made clear in an earlier statement, 'the entire land of Palestine is *waqf* [an inalienable endowment in Islamic law] and blessed land...it is [therefore] prohibited to sell, bestow ownership or facilitate the occupation of even a millimetre of it,' How can there be progress towards the projected 'two state solution' when one of the parties is acting in such blatant bad faith?

2 Enemies of Zion

What of the other party to the 'peace process', the 'Zionist entity'? At its most basic, Zionism is the demand that the Jews, like all other peoples, have the right to their own independent state in their ancestral homeland. This goal only began to win broad support from world Jewry when an ascending series of anti-Semitic outrages, beginning with the 'Dreyfus Affair' in France at the end of the nineteenth century, followed by pogroms in Tsarist Russia and climaxed by the horrors of Nazi Germany, convinced with good reason increasing numbers of Jews that through no fault of their own, their many and persistent attempts to assimilate had failed, and that consequently only a Jewish state would afford the security and freedoms the world seemed either unable or unwilling to grant. And the pioneers of Zionism made it very clear from its inception that it addressed itself to all Jews irrespective of faith; that theirs was a secular movement for a secular state. Not, like Pakistan, a state for a religion, but a state for a people. That and nothing more. So to be anti-Zionist, as nearly all the far left is, is to deny the right of the Jews to have and live in such a state.

The far left's explicit anti-Zionism therefore constitutes a total rejection of the right of Israel to exist at all, and should not be confused with an entirely legitimate debate, which also goes on between Jews, over where the borders of Israel should be drawn, and whether the policies and actions of Israeli governments, such the justly condemned (by Jews as well as others) extension of Jewish settlements in the West Bank, are obstructing rather than contributing towards the achievement of a two-state solution. There is also another inconsistency in the anti-Zionist left's hostility towards Israel. The methods used by nationalist movements and guerrilla armies the world over, irrespective of any indifference they may have to civilian casualties or however authoritarian their ideology, are never seen as reasons to withhold support for their goal of an independent state. The suicide bombing of Jewish civilians by Hamas is a case in point. (As we shall see, some on the far left have even justified it.) All changes when it comes to Israel. Its democratic political system counts for nothing, nor its genuine, if inevitably not always successful, attempts to avoid civilian casualties when responding to terrorist attacks. In contrast with the left's indifference to the methods of other national movements, those often falsely ascribed to Israel and denounced as 'war crimes and 'genocide' are cited as one more reason why Israel should not exist. In the eyes of the anti-Zionist left, nothing it can do or be can qualify Israel as having the right to its existence as a Jewish state alongside its Arab neighbours. It must therefore be obliterated.

Opposition to Zionism is not, however a monopoly of the left, Arab nationalists, or Islam. As we shall see, it is also shared with Nazis, the United Nations, Rabbis and, from its very beginning, by the Vatican. From Pius X (1903-1914) onwards, a succession of Popes, motivated by a biblically-derived hostility towards the Jewish faith, rejected repeated requests by Zionist leaders to look kindly on their enterprise. When Theodore Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism, sought the support of Pius X for his project, the Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry de Val, replied that this was impossible, the reason being that 'as long as the Jews deny the divinity of Christ, we cannot make a declaration in their favour...in order for us to come out

for the Jewish people in the way you desire, they would have to be converted.' A personal audience with Pius X was no more productive. Herzl was bluntly told that 'the Jews have not recognised our Lord; therefore, we cannot recognise the Jewish people'. However, that like Judaism, Islam does not recognize the 'divinity' and 'lord' of Christianity proved no obstacle to the Vatican recognising the legitimacy of the Palestinian Authority and establishing the best of diplomatic relations with Islamic regimes dedicated to the elimination of the state of Israel, and even with those that persecute and do little or nothing to prevent the murder of their various Christian minorities. While it took 46 years for the Vatican to establish diplomatic relations with Israel, it had meantime done so with 16 officially Islamic states. This spurning of Israel was in effect simply a post-war continuation of the Vatican's historic hostility towards the Jews that climaxed in the reign (1939-1958) of 'Hitler's Pope', Pius XII. Even in 1943, as the Holocaust, with the Pope's full knowledge and proven indifference, climaxed in the death camps of the Third Reich, the Vatican's Apostolic Delegate to Washington implored President Roosevelt to use his influence to prevent the creation of a Jewish state in the British Mandate, as this would be 'a severe blow to the religious attachment of the Catholics to this land.'

Unmoved by the tragedy of the Holocaust, and thus the necessity of a Jewish state to prevent another, the Vatican's anti-Zionist campaign continued after the war in the run-up to the UN vote in November 1947 on the creation of a Jewish state in a part of the old mandated territories. Catholics of UN member states were encouraged to pressure their governments into voting against recognition for Israel. When this tactic failed, Pius XII went as far as he dared in supporting the invasion the Arabs unleashed on the very first day of the new state's existence. *L'Osservatore Romano*, the official Vatican daily, proclaimed that 'Modern Israel is not the true heir of Biblical Israel, but a secular state [this much was true] ... Therefore the Holy Land and its sacred sites belong to Christianity, the true Israel.' And if not, then rather the Muslim Arabs than the betrayers of Christ. The Vatican vitriol heaped on Zionism had what is now a familiar ring. *Documentation Catholique*, a journal of the same French Catholic Church whose clergy had, in the majority of cases, collaborated with Vichy and the Nazis, and stood aside as French and refugee Jews were rounded up and dispatched to their deaths in the gas chambers of the Third Reich, denounced Zionism as the 'new Nazism'. This was rich indeed, coming from a church that had always looked with approval on any regime, including fascist ones, that shared its abhorrence of 'godless communism'. One such was that of General Franco, under whose clerically supervised system of censorship there was published in 1963 a Spanish language edition of the ubiquitous *Protocols*. On the front cover was a classic crucifixion scene, with above Christ's head, surmounting the cross, the three heads of a snake, representing the Jewish faith, Communism...and the state of Israel. Below was the caption: 'Plan: Destruction of Christianity, Enslavement of Humanity'.

Among the states the Vatican maintained the best of relations with was the genocidal regime of Saddam Hussein. In early 2003, as the prospect of a US-led invasion of Iraq loomed ever larger, the Vatican mobilised all its considerable diplomatic resources to prevent the dictator's overthrow, an action Pope Jean Paul II warned would be a 'defeat for humanity', while top Vatican official Cardinal Renato Martino spoke of his 'compassion' and 'pity' for a thug who ruled by mass murder, terror, torture and fear. (See last Addendum to Appendix T for examples of

Sadam's 'humanity') The Roman Catholic vendetta against Israel ended, even if only officially, in 1994 when, its policy of slander and boycott having proved a failure, the Vatican admitted defeat and established full diplomatic relations with the Jewish state. But it did not abandon its historic pro-Arab strategy, maintaining and then expanding its links with anti-Zionist and openly anti-Semitic terrorist movements in the Middle East. The Vatican's 'recognition' of the terrorist, anti-Semitic PLO on came on February 15, 2000, at the height of a long series of murderous attacks on Israel civilians organised and executed by affiliates of this same PLO, one that began with the murder of the Israeli team at the Munich Olympics of 1972. But this was nothing new for the Papacy. After years of stalled negotiations on a Concordat with secular Weimar Germany, Pius XI hastened to conclude the Vatican's treaty with the otherwise diplomatically isolated (except from the USSR) Nazi regime in April 1933, just as Storm Troopers were unleashing their first savage attacks on German's besieged Jews, beginning with the official boycott of Jewish shops and other premises on April 1. His successor, 'Hitler's Pope' Eugenio Pacelli, Pius (sic) XII, remained true to the treaty with the Third Reich to its very end, and even beyond. Having closed his eyes to the Holocaust, with his approval, Franciscan friars then sheltered and spirited away thousands of its perpetrators to the safety of Catholic South America and the Islamic Middle East where, except for Israel's kidnapping, trial, conviction and execution of Holocaust organiser Adolf Eichmann, they lived out the rest of their lives in comfort and security. (On June 23, 1960, Eichmann's abduction from Argentina was condemned by the UN Security Council by 8 votes to nil with two abstentions and none against.)

The consummation of the Vatican's pro-Arab strategy came on May 13, 2015, when, re-enacting its 1933 Concordat with Hitler, it proclaimed *urbis et orbis* that Rome had joined with the European Union and a number of its member states in extending full diplomatic recognition to the Palestinian Authority. (The last election conducted by the Palestine Authority had been in 2006. At the time of writing (August 2023, there have been none since, even though they are by law to be held every four years.) Three days later, sealing the alliance, its Holocaust-denying, anti-Semitic, terrorism-promoting President Mahmoud Abbas arrived in Rome as the guest of Pope Francis II. During their encounter, the Pope presented Abbas with a medal depicting an angel of peace. (sic!!!) Reports vary slightly as to what words the Pope actually used during the ceremony. The following is taken to be the most accurate: 'May the angel of peace defy the evil spirit of war. I think of you: may you be the angel of peace.' Meanwhile, back in Jerusalem, the Angel of Peace's Fatah were inciting and applauding the murder of Jewish civilians..

Working in tandem, if not in cahoots, with the Vatican against Israel, was the Kremlin. Although Stalin was himself an anti-Semite, his delegates to the UN voted in November 1947 for the resolution establishing the state of Israel on what proved to be his false assumption that in return, its left-wing founders would support the Soviet Union in the Cold War then just getting under way. But Israel, unlike the puppet regimes Stalin created in East Europe at the end of the Second World War, made it very clear it was pursuing its own interests, and nobody else's. The response from Moscow was Stalin's vicious anti-Semitic campaign in the USSR and the satellite states of Eastern Europe. (See Appendix W) Prominent Jews were denounced as 'cosmopolitans without kith or kin' for their presumed prior loyalty to the new state of Israel, while others suspected of Zionist sympathies were rounded

up and deported to labour camps in the east. Some were just murdered, others tried and executed for treason, as in the notorious case of the purge of the Soviet Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee. Stalin's anti-Semitic onslaught climaxed in the last weeks of his life, when in Moscow, Jewish doctors working in the Kremlin were arrested on bogus charges of plotting to poison the Soviet leadership (poisoning is a centuries-old charge against Jews) while in Prague, 14 Czech Communist Party leaders, no fewer than eleven of them Jews, went on trial on charges of treason, in the case of the Jewish defendants, framed as Zionists secretly serving the interests of the USA and Israel. Jews were denounced daily in the Soviet press as either potential or actual traitors. In the last days before Stalin's death, invective escalated into deeds, as preparations began for a Nazi-style deportation of the entire Jewish population of the Soviet Union to the east. Stalin's death in March 1953 came too late to save those convicted at the Prague trial, but just in time to secure the release of the Kremlin doctors. (See Appendix W) In the 'thaw' that followed, it seemed that Soviet Jewry could breathe again. Then, in the mid-1950s, came a new development that in the long run, again boded ill for the Soviet Union's Jews. With the emergence of a revitalised Arab nationalism, personified by the coming to power in 1954 of Colonel Nasser as President of Egypt, and the rise of Ba'athism in Iraq and Syria, the Kremlin made its first serious attempt, after the failure with Israel, to establish a foothold in the Middle East, now seen as strategic in the cold war. As the Kremlin became the quartermaster to the armed forces of Israel's Arab neighbours, so its policy towards Israel inevitably became increasingly hostile, and in turn affected the standing of Jews not only within the Soviet Union but the entire Soviet bloc. Anti-Semitism, as always (very) thinly disguised as anti-Zionism, ran riot, to the embarrassment and even disgust of some western communists.

The Kremlin's domestic literary campaign against Zionism climaxed in 1963 with the publication of *Judaism Without Embellishment* by Trofim Kichko. Stated briefly, this work of 192 pages was a recasting in a contemporary context of the central theme of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* – one of a World Jewish Conspiracy with a special emphasis on the now familiar Arab and Sharia left fiction of Zionist-Nazi collaboration and the concomitant evils of the state of Israel. (See Chapter Five) One of its many anti-Semitic cartoons captured the book's message and tone. A Jew with the regulation huge hooked nose is depicted stooping to kiss a Nazi jackboot, with the lying caption: 'During the Hitlerite occupation [of the Soviet Union], the Zionist leaders served the fascists'. The truth is that during the Nazi occupation of the Soviet Union, the 'Hitlerites', with whom Stalin concluded the pact of friendship that in August 1939 unleashed the Second World War, murdered two million Jews, many being rounded up and killed with the assistance of anti-Semitic Soviet collaborators from the Ukraine and the Baltic States. By contrast with these traitors, 600,000 Jews served in the Soviet armed forces, of whom 142,000 died in action. Partisan units composed entirely of Jews fought not only the Nazis behind enemy lines, but the Ukrainian SS, whose anti-Semitic volunteers were only too willing to pull on a pair of shiny new Nazi jackboots.

Concerns about adverse reactions in the west to the Kremlin's anti-Semitism took second place to its geopolitical interests in the Middle East, which demanded relentless Jew baiting at home and a firm public stance against Zionism abroad, a policy which inevitably rebounded adversely on Soviet Jewry and led to a desire for emigration, in most cases, preferably to Israel... the so called 'refuseniks'. At the conclusion of the June war of 1967, to demonstrate its solidarity with the defeated

Arab states, the Kremlin and its satellites severed their diplomatic relations with Israel, re-enforcing the isolationist policy already being pursued by the Vatican and every Arab and Muslim state. Soviet Jews were denied the right to emigrate, on the correct assumption that many would settle in Israel and so antagonise the Arab states courted by the Kremlin. Another gesture designed to demonstrate the Kremlin's anti-Zionist credentials was the Soviet Union's and its satellites' vote for the 1975 resolution condemning Zionism as a racist ideology. Only after the collapse of the USSR were full diplomatic relations resumed, but now with the Russian Federation. Today, the Kremlin still fishes in the troubled waters of the Middle East by pursuing a pro Shi'a strategy to counteract Washington's alliance with Sunni Saudi Arabia. This has led Russia to promote close ties with Syria and Iran, and through Iran, to its proxy Hezbollah and ally Hamas, both of which, like their patrons, quite openly seek the destruction of Israel. Following Russia's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, anti-Semitism was once more on the rise, cynically exploited by Putin in comments he made about Ukraine's Jewish President. (See Appendix XIV)

Of all the 'institutionalised' oppositions to Zionism, that of the Arabs and Islam is the most advertised and known. In view of the truly vast number of Islamic diatribes against the Jews and Zionism, some of which we will be encountering in the course of this work, the following has been selected because it captures better than most the future Islam has in store, not just for the Jews, but for all non-Muslims:

The day will come when we shall rule over America. The day will come when we shall rule over Britain, we shall rule over the entire world, except for the Jews. The Jews will not live under us agreeably [i.e., submissively] permanently, since they have been treacherous in nature throughout history. A day will come when we shall wrest from the Jews, even the tree and the stone, which have suffered from them. Listen to your beloved Mohammed, who tells you about the dire end of the Jews. The tree and the stone want the Muslim to bring every Jew to his end. (Sheikh Ibrahim Madayis, Friday Sermon, Palestinian Authority TV, May 13, 2005.)

According to the legends woven by Sharia 'historians' and expounded most notoriously in the UK by Ken Livingstone, former Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn's longstanding friend, political ally and until his suspension on charges of anti-Semitism, 'defence' adviser, the Nazis were fervent champions of Zionism. And yet, as one would expect, like Hamas, Hitler saw Zionism as central to the Jewish conspiracy to achieve world domination. As he explained in *Mein Kampf*, the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine (which, remember Livingstone claims Hitler supported) was to intended serve the Jews as 'a central organisation for their international world swindle, endowed with its own sovereign rights and removed from the intervention of other states: a haven for convicted scoundrels and a university for budding crooks.' This quotation, cited with full approval, is to be found on the website of a close friend of Corbyn, namely, Elleanne Green, one of three administrators of the (secret) Palestine Live group, which from 2013 to 2015, had its most illustrious member, that veteran peace and anti-racist campaigner, the very same Jeremy Corbyn. (For the full sordid story, see Appendix T.) Disputes among Jews as to the viability or necessity of the Zionist project were, as far as Hitler was concerned, not to be taken seriously. All were

Zionists at heart: 'When examined more closely, this appearance dissolved into an unsavoury vapour of pretexts advanced for reasons of mere expediency, not to say lies.'

Without being able to cite any evidence (because none exists) Livingstone believed that Hitler initially supported the aims of Zionism before 'going mad and ended up killing six million Jews', a claim it is impossible to reconcile with Hitler's well-advertised views on Zionism that he expounded as far back as 1925, the year of the publication of his *Mein Kampf*, where he set out clearly his goal of 'extermin[ating]' Germany's 'international poisoners', the Jews. To anyone who is the least conversant with the motivating force of Hitler's policies, it was only natural that with the outbreak of the Second World War, his obsessional fear and loathing of the Jews would result in his welcoming of an alliance with Islamic and Arab nationalist leaders in the Middle East who shared his hostility to the Zionist enterprise, and the dominant influence exerted by the British empire in the Middle East. Such was the purpose and outcome of the meeting in Berlin with the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem Haj Amin al-Husseini, on November 28, 1941. The official protocol of the meeting records the Mufti declaring that the Arabs and the Germans had the same enemies, 'namely the English, the Jews and the Communists'. al-Husseini then referred, revealingly, to an assurance he had already received from the Nazi leadership promising 'support for the elimination of the Jewish national home'; to which Hitler replied that since 'Germany stood for uncompromising war against the Jews', 'that naturally included active opposition to the Jewish national home in Palestine, which was nothing more than a centre, in the form of state [the PLO's 'Zionist entity' no less], for the exercise of destructive influence by Jewish interests'. The Mufti later related in his Memoires that he 'asked Hitler for an explicit undertaking to allow us to solve the Jewish problem in a manner befitting our national and racial aspirations and according to the scientific methods innovated by Germany [i.e., gassing] in the handling of its Jews. The answer I got was: "The Jews are yours."' Hitler assured his Muslim guest that the Nazi war of extermination against the Jews 'includes the fight against the so-called Jewish National Home in Palestine'. The official protocol (for full text, see Appendix S) records the following undertaking given by Hitler to the Grand Mufti, 'enjoining him to lock it in the uttermost depths of his heart':

'1: He (the Fuhrer) would carry on the battle to the total destruction of the Judeo-Communist empire in Europe.

2: At some moment which was impossible to set exactly today but which at any event was not distant, the German armies would reach the southern exit from Caucasia.

3: As soon as this happened, the Fuhrer would on his own give the Arab world the assurance that its hour of liberation had arrived. Germany's objective would then be solely the destruction of the Jewish element residing under the protection of British power. In that hour, the Mufti would be the most authoritative spokesman for the Arab world. It would then be his task to set off the Arab operations which he had secretly prepared. When that time had come, Germany could also be indifferent to [Vichy] French reaction to such a declaration.'

Such was the pledge made by Hitler to his *Fuhrer* designate of Palestine, whom Yasser Arafat, the terrorist Nobel Peace Prize winner and, from 1969 until his death

in 2004, Chairman of the Palestinian Liberation Organisation and, from 1994, the first President of the Palestinian Authority, saluted as 'our hero'. So we can be sure, if the pattern of events in Nazi occupied Europe is a reliable guide, that had Rommel, and not Montgomery been victorious at El Alamein, the sequel would have been the extermination of the Jews of the Middle East and the installation of the Grand Mufti as the Quisling of a *Judenfrei* Palestine.

Finally, we have the United Nations, the body that on November 20, 1947, by a far from unanimous vote, approved the creation of two states out of the British Mandate, one Jewish, the other Palestinian. The Jews accepted the deal, the six Arab member states, having voted against it, did not, choosing instead to launch a war of annihilation against Israel, *and of conquest of the territory allotted to the Palestinians*. Defeated by the fledgling Jewish state, the Arab invaders had to content themselves with carving up what remained of the Mandate, with Jordan annexing what is now the West Bank and Egypt occupying the Gaza Strip. In the mid-1950s, in response to the emergence of radical semi-secular Arab nationalist movements in the region and a growing number of Arab and Muslims states achieving independence, and thus membership of the UN, the Soviet bloc under Khrushchev adopted a pro-Arab strategy in the Middle East. As a direct consequence of this new alignment, an anti-Israel majority began to coalesce, first in the UN General Assembly, and then in the UN Human Rights Council, a body which today devotes nearly all of its time and energies to concocting and approving resolutions condemning alleged Israeli war crimes and human rights violations, the classic case being when in 2016, Israel, where women are equal under law and treated as such, was found to be guilty of violating the human rights of women by the usual coalition of Islamic and 'third world' states that do so by law, religion and ancient custom.

The Council's in-built bias is unique in that of all United Nations bodies, it is the only one that has awarded itself the procedural right to examine at each of its sessions the alleged wrong-doings of Israel. No other country is subject to this level of scrutiny, criticism and condemnation, either by the UN or the world's media. As for the General Assembly, it accepts without protest, let alone disciplinary action, repeated threats by one of its member states, Iran, to 'wipe off the map' another member state, Israel, and the collective repudiation in 1990 by the 57 members of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference of the UN's founding Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And it is these same states that are allowed, again without protest, to wage their ceaseless vendetta against Israel, accusing it of violating the same human rights they themselves not only routinely violate but explicitly hold in contempt. (For details see Addendum to Appendix II)

The prime example is Saudi Arabia. In 2014, the monarchy's swordsmen carried out 87 public executions, some for actions that in the west and according to the UN are not even considered crimes. Then, in 2015, Saudi Arabia was rewarded for this exemplary enforcement of Allah's will by its appointment to head the UN Council for Human Rights, rights which the Saudis, along with the other 56 members of the OIC, explicitly rejected in their 1990 Cairo Declaration. Warming to their task of protecting these rights, during the year of their chairmanship, under the watchful eye of their fulsomely praised new and allegedly reforming king, Salman Al Saud, the Saudis doubled their execution rate to 175. As for Iran's threats against Israel, the position of the United Nations on threats made by one-member state to another, as defined on its official website, reads as follows: 'The core values and principles

of the UN include respect for the [UN] Charter and international law, respect for the sovereign equality of States and the principle of the non-use or the threat of use of force.' Iran was clearly in breach of this principle, yet nothing was done to ensure that its theocratic rulers complied with it. But this was nothing new. From the birth of modern Zionism at the end of the nineteenth century, Israel's road to independence had not been an easy one. On the way, it found few friends, and confronted many enemies... Allah, the Vatican, Hitler, the Kremlin and today the United Nations. So when the Sharia left launched its own offensive against Israel, it found itself following a well-trodden path.

One of the most striking aspects of the far left's obsession with the Palestinian issue is how even here it is highly selective, while at the same time exhibiting chronic innumeracy. True, the Palestine issue cannot be reduced simply to one of numbers, but neither are they irrelevant. The combined Palestinian population of the West Bank and Gaza, which constitute the territory of the Palestinian Authority, is 5.7 million. 2 million Palestinians live within the borders of Israel, while another 8 million live in neighbouring Arab states, mainly Jordan, where half of the kingdom is Palestinian, the other half Bedouin. How this came to be so dates back to the years immediately after the Second World War. In 1948, the United Nations ended the British Mandate in Palestine that had been established by the League of Nations after the carve-up of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the First World War. Prior to 1918, throughout their centuries of rule over the region, the Muslim Ottomans never recognised the existence, let alone respected the rights of a Palestinian people, any more than did their Muslim Abbasid predecessors, who ruled the territory from the 8th to the 13th century after their expulsion of the Christian Byzantine empire. Since the territories' conquest by the Roman Empire in BC 63, when it was wholly populated by Jews, until May 15, 1948, with the establishment of Israel, there had in fact never been an independent state in what anti-Zionists call Palestine. Even the name was invited by Emperor Hadrian in AD 135, derived from the biblical Philistines, who originated in Crete. Until then, it had been known for centuries by its Jewish name, Judea. Mohammed never set foot on its land, the arrival of Islam dating from the conquest of Jerusalem, hitherto part of the Eastern, or Byzantine Roman Empire, in AD 637. (Contrary to politically correct history, unlike the Jihads of Islam, the Crusades were not, according to the modern definition of that term, wars of aggression, but a series of failed attempts to return Jerusalem and the 'Holy Land' to Christendom.)

The territories that are now modern Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, came under Turkish rule, that of the Ottomans, in 1516, after the defeat of the Egyptian Mamluk dynasty at the battle of Marj Dabiq, and remained such until Turkey's defeat in the First World War. Then followed a period of British administration on behalf of a League of Nations mandate pending a final settlement of their status. This mandate was terminated by the UK on May 15, 1948, one day after the proclamation of Israeli independence. With the Palestinians of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip respectively under the illegal annexation by Jordan and occupation by Egypt, the 'Palestine Question' only came onto the Arab agenda sixteen years after the establishment of the state of Israel with the founding of the PLO in 1964, and even then, only as a means to rally Arab support for Israel's destruction and conquest, not to create a united Palestinian nation state. With Egypt and Jordan as the PLO's two main patrons, bordering as they both did on Israel, there was no question of either the West Bank or the Gaza Strip, entirely

populated though they both were by Palestinians, comprising any part of the projected Palestinian state, not to speak of the Palestinians of Jordan proper. Its allotted territory was to be only that of the 'Zionist entity', Israel, where Jews comprised 88% of its population. We shall see in due course what was to be the intended fate of these Jewish inhabitants. And so the stage was set for the conflict that has plagued not only the Middle East but to large degree, world politics, over the next half century and more.

And yet, but for Islamo-Arab anti-Semitism and territorial piracy by Israel's neighbours, the story could have been so different. In 1947, the United Nations proposed a three-way partition of the former Mandate. A new state, comprising 74% of the Mandate, had already in 1946 been created under a branch of the Hashemite dynasty, initially called Trans-Jordan, then later simply Jordan, in land laying east of the River Jordan, hence the name. This left the rest of the mandated territory, to the west of the Jordan, to be divided into two further new states, one for Jews, the other for Palestinians, with Jerusalem to be placed under international UN control. This proposal, agreed by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 29, 1947, was also accepted by the Zionist leadership, *but rejected by the Arab League*, which had its own plans for the territory, which most certainly did not include the establishment of either a Jewish or, and this is most revealing, a Palestinian state. Even Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas admitted, in the light of what ensued, that this decision by the Arab League, supposedly the friend of their Arab brothers, the Palestinians, was 'a mistake'. The fate the Arab leaders had in mind for the minuscule state of Israel the UN intended to create out of just over half (55%) of what remained of the British Mandate territory was announced to the world in October 1947 by the Secretary General of the Arab League, Abdul Rahman Azzam. Arab armies would 'launch a war of extermination and monumental massacre which will be spoken like [those of] the Mongolians and the Crusades.' Ignoring the standard genocidal rhetoric, the question needed to be posed...why make war on Israel, when the needs of the Arabs in the Mandate had been accommodated no less than those of the Jews? The answer is to be found in Islamic theology. In the words of a Saudi preacher on Hamas TV, Dr Walid Al-Rashudi, 'the Jews are the enemies of Allah. Kill them one by one, and don't leave even one.' The religion of peace.

When the United Nations approved the boundaries and creation of the state of Israel, in addition to establishing Trans-Jordan, as we have seen, it at the same time as creating the new state of Israel, allotted to a projected independent Palestinian state the remaining 45% of the territory that had been the British Mandate that lay to the west of the river Jordan, an area consisting chiefly of the main Arab population centres of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Had the Arab leaders not rejected this proposal for a 'two state solution', there would today be no legitimate grounds for any Israeli-Palestinian conflict, because the Palestinians would have acquired in 1948 the state they now, at least officially, demand, and are provided for in the Israel-PLO Oslo Accords of 1993. Since the territory allotted to the Palestinians was rejected by the Arab states, with the lapse of first the British, then the UN mandates, it could be argued that legally, it now belonged to nobody. It certainly does not belong to Israel, any more than does any part of Israel to Hamas, not least because both claims are derived from ancient religious texts that have no status under international law. The same applies to Israel's so-called 'settlements' in the West Bank, which contravene Article 49 of the

Fourth Geneva Convention and the Hague Regulations of 1907. Neither of these conventions state that the occupation of another country's territories at the end of war, such as Israel did after the June War of 1967 and the Allies after Germany's defeat in 1945, is *ipso facto* illegal. But such occupations must respect the rules laid down by these conventions. This Israel has clearly not done.

1947 was not the first and would not be the last occasion when Arab leaders spurned the opportunity to create an independent Palestinian state alongside a Jewish one. In 1937, following anti-Jewish riots instigated the previous year by the pro-Nazi Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al Husseini, the British government proposed the partitioning of the Mandate between an Arab state federated with Trans-Jordan, occupying 80% of Mandate territory, and a much smaller Jewish state, with the remaining 20%. As in 1947, the Arab leaders would have none of it. It was to be all or nothing. So, as in 1947, the Palestinians got nothing.

Unavoidably, in 1947, the untidy process of drawing the boundaries of the proposed new states consigned some Jewish settlements to the proposed Palestinian state, and Arab ones to Israel. To this Arab minority still within the proposed Jewish state, its first Prime Minister, David Ben Gurion made the following appeal and pledge: 'We call upon the sons of the Arab people who dwell in Israel to live in peace and to play their part in building up the State on the basis of free and equal citizenship and due representation in all its institutions, provisional and permanent.' But, as in 1937, no one amongst the Arab leadership was listening. From 1948 until now, peace with Israel's Palestinian neighbours has been and remains remote at best because the Jihadis among their leaders refuse to renounce the goal of the Jewish state's destruction. However, the promise made by Ben Gurion to those Arabs who remained within its borders has been honoured by affording them equal citizenship with Jews, giving the lie to far leftist claims of an Israeli 'apartheid' and even, as we shall see, 'genocide'.

On May 14, 1948, the day of Israel's independence, five Arab armies launched their failed bid, in the words of Iran President Ayatollah Ahmadinejad, to 'wipe off the map' the newly born state of Israel. As already stated, and it needs to be repeated in view of the lies repeated *ad nauseam* about the origins of the state of Israel as a 'colonial enterprise', Israel's Arab enemies had no more interest in an independent Palestinian state than they did a Jewish one, though the offer had been there on the table, accepted by Israel, and had only needed to be taken up to transform it into a reality. The fact, and in retrospect tragedy, that it was not, can only be laid at the door of the rulers of the Arab states. Their concern was not the creation of a Palestinian state but a 'no state solution' involving the annexing all of the Mandate, invading and parcelling out, not only the new state of Israel, but also the lands allocated by the UN to the proposed new state of Palestine, what are now called the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. At the war's end, as partial compensation for defeat at the hands of Israel, King Abdullah of Jordan, after occupying the West Bank illegally in 1948, in 1950, again illegally, annexed east Jerusalem and the entire West Bank, while King Farouk of Egypt, likewise illegally, seized the Gaza Strip, these being the same two territories that had comprised the core of the projected Palestinian state. They now became, in defiance of the UN resolution of November 1947, occupied and annexed territories, not by Jews but by brother Arabs and Muslims. How many of those campaigning against Zionism today know that it was not Israel that denied the Palestinians their long-awaited independence, but

their fellow Arabs, a betrayal that even the President of the Palestinian Authority has recognised and deplored. This is a history that has long been buried, for reasons that require no explanation.

Much is made on the left, and far beyond it, of the plight of those Arabs described as Palestinian refugees from the war of 1948, a war imposed on a sovereign state established by the United Nations. The vast majority are too young to have ever lived in the territory that is now Israel. So...refugees from what, and where? The only refugee exodus from Israel, instigated by its Arab invaders and intended to be for no longer than the duration of what they believed would be a victorious war, occurred during and in the wake of the combined Arab attack on the new state in May 1948, and totalled, according the UN, 470,000. 180,000 Arabs remained within the new Jewish state. This generation of genuine refugees has largely died out. Their children and grandchildren were born and have lived ever since in camps situated in mainly Gaza, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, maintained not by their Arab brothers, from whom they are not only physically but in many cases legally segregated, but by the United Nations, and used as cannon and propaganda fodder for the Jihadi war against Israel. Their hosts have steadfastly refused to integrate them into society, denying them citizenship rights (such as they are) and employment, and leaving the provision of essential services to UNRWA, the largely Palestinian-staffed United Nations Relief and Works Agency. Three of their hosts, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, have at different times launched military offensives against their guests, killing in a few days more Palestinians than have died in conflicts with Israel since 1948. After the 1970 'Black September' Jordanian onslaught on the PLO, President Nasser of Egypt even accused King Hussain, not Israel, of perpetrating no less than 'genocide' against the Palestinians. Few if any on the left, or anywhere else for that matter, cared that simultaneously with the largely voluntary Arab exodus from Israel in 1948, Jews were being driven by mob violence and government action from the Arab states of the Middle East and north Africa, or probably even knew that by 1972, the number of Jewish refugees from Arab states had reached 870,000, of whom 586,000 had settled in Israel, not as pariahs segregated in UN-funded camps, but as full citizens.

The strange saga of the hitherto non-existent Palestinians took a new turn in 1964 when, with the support of a number of Arab states, principally Egypt, and the approval of the Kremlin, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation was founded under the leadership of its chairman, the fanatical anti-Semite Ahmed Shukairy. However, its capacity for independent action was circumscribed by the fact that its purse strings remained tightly in the hands of its Arab patrons. Their motives were transparent, and still are. The PLO would serve as a conduit to channel Palestinian frustrations away from legitimate territorial demands on Arab states, principally Jordan and Egypt, and towards the only land in the region that was not under Arab rule...Israel...whose population was overwhelmingly Jewish. In its founding Covenant, the PLO naturally demanded the elimination of what it habitually called the 'Zionist entity', and the creation of a Palestinian state, which it defined in Article Two as lying within the boundaries of the former British Mandate. At the time of the Covenant's adoption in 1964, there were no Israeli 'occupied territories', Israel being confined within its pre-1967 borders, so it therefore followed that the vast majority of Palestinians were then living in territories under Arab rule. Were they too to be 'liberated'?

Although on paper, the PLO demanded an independent state for those Palestinians under Egyptian and Jordanian rule as well as those living in Israel, because of its dependency on Egyptian and Jordanian sponsorship, in practical terms, the 'liberation of Palestine' was necessarily restricted to the 300,000 Palestinians living in Israel, where they constituted a minority of around 10% of the overwhelmingly Jewish state. The Palestinian West Bank that had been annexed by Jordan, and the Gaza Strip, still under the rule of the PLO's chief patron, Egypt, were obviously off limits, not to speak of Palestinians living under the Hashemite monarchy in the original 'east bank' or 'Trans' Jordan as it was prior to the annexations of 1950. Yes, said the Arab League, the PLO could have its Palestinian state...but not at the expense of territories belonging (albeit stolen) to the very states that funded its activities, supplied its arms, hosted its offices, bases and training camps, and provided for the life-style of its leaders. The PLO understood this, and had to accept it, explicitly, in Article 27, in which it pledged itself 'not to interfere in the internal affairs of any Arab state.' Some Palestinians were...and remain to this day...more Palestinian than others. And so, by this process of elimination forced on the PLO by its Arab patrons, the objective of the PLO was whittled down to the only option remaining: the destruction of the state of Israel, whereas an independent Palestinian state could have been established almost overnight by a merger of the ninety per cent or more of Palestinians then living under Egyptian and Jordanian rule, in territories that had been designated as a fully-independent Palestinian state by the UN resolution of November 1947.

Ironically, when the Palestinians, as they should, do achieve their goal of an independent state, they will have Israel to thank for the return of these stolen territories, because after the defeat of Egypt and Jordan in the Arab-Israeli war of June 1967, the West Bank was occupied but, unlike Jordan, not annexed by Israel. As for Gaza, illegally occupied by Egypt since 1948, by agreement with Israel, Egypt relinquished its claim on the Strip in 1978, from which Israel then withdrew entirely in 2005. Jordan gave up its illegal claim on the Israeli-occupied West Bank in 1988. Separated by Israel in 1967 from Egyptian and Jordanian rule, these two territories, and no others, now comprise the Palestinian Authority. It is one of those quirks of history that if Egypt today still retained Gaza, and Jordan the West Bank, there would be no Palestinian Authority and therefore no territory available for the establishment of a Palestinian state. The PLO would still be eking out a miserable existence as a landless and powerless government-in-exile from a dingy office in Cairo, Amman or some other Middle Eastern capital. At least now, it has both land and powers.

As for 'colonial' Israel, in addition to providing the PA with water and electricity as well as other essential supplies, it annually contributes two thirds of the taxes collected by the PA, even though its contributions to the PA budget in all probability have helped fund anti-Zionist propaganda, salaries paid to convicted terrorists, many of them assassins, in Israeli jails, and even possibly acts of terrorism. But Israel goes on funding the PA, unlike its brother Arabs. Even though their collective territory (400 times greater than that of Israel) population (56 times greater at 450 million) wealth and natural resources dwarf those of tiny Israel, the Arab states have repeatedly failed to honour pledges to assist in the financing of the PA. In 2002, the 22 Arab League states agreed to make an annual joint payment to the PA. In the event, only three did so. By contrast, in addition to the aid provided by the Zionist genocidists, the US imperialists and Europe annually contribute three

times more to the PA budget than all the Arab states combined. The PA leaders must surely be outraged at this lack of solidarity from their Arab brothers...but what can they say? Long ago they had to swallow the cynical *diktat* imposed by these same states which today obliges the PA to surrender an entirely legitimate claim to represent the seven million or more Palestinians living both outside Israel and its own two territories, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. The reason is obvious. For all their public declarations of solidarity with the Palestinian cause, neither the Arab League, nor the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, which represents the 57 Islamic states, would ever countenance such a challenge to the territorial integrity of a fellow Islamic, Arab state. Consequently, the only territorial demands permitted are those made upon Israel, varying from major border adjustments to total obliteration. Some Palestinians are more Palestinian than others. This is the policy which the Sharia left obediently follows.

What ISIS and al-Qaeda really thought of their Palestinian brothers became all too clear when in the first week of April 2015 they sunk their doctrinal differences to launch a combined assault on the Yarmouk Palestinian 'refugee' camp in the southern outskirts of Damascus. The camp had already been the target of a two-year fraternal artillery barrage by forces loyal to Syria's beleaguered Ba'athist President, Bashar al-Assad (who denies even the existence of a Palestinian people, let alone their right to a state), reducing its population from half a million to 18,000. Now, to add to its miseries, it was overrun by ISIS and al-Qaeda Jihadis, who then set about eliminating the various Palestinian factions that for years had been competing for control of the camp's occupants. While Jihadis in Syria directed their fire against their Arab brothers, the Palestinian authority seemed more concerned with threats from another quarter entirely...Jewish sportsmen. PA football officials were busy with a campaign to expel Israel from FIFA, while on the West Bank, the PA's Ministry of Information (sic) was raising the alarm about a new form of Jewish terrorism, namely a Marathon event, which apparently constituted an 'aggression against Palestinian territories and a new form of Israel arrogance'. The call went out to human rights organisations, demanding that they 'focus on the terror of settlers, which is this time disguised in sports clothing'. Meanwhile, the very real ISIS terror against the Palestinians in the Yarmouk camp continued unabated and as far as the world's media were concerned, largely unreported. Yet according to Action for Palestine, at the end of 2016, the Assad regime was holding the corpses of 456 Palestinian prisoners tortured to death in its prisons. As always when the blame could not be pinned on the Jews, the Sharia left and its Muslim allies ignored this new betrayal of the Palestinians by their Islamic brothers. Since their 'Stop the War Coalition' and 'Palestinian Solidarity [sic] Campaign' both supported the Assad regime and its Iranian and Moscow patrons, once again, the streets remained silent.

Equally opportunist, and no less cynical, considerations govern the anti-Zionist left's attitude to the Kurds. Unless one was aware of the forces shaping and driving the Sharia left, one would reasonably assume that it would display no less a concern for the Kurdish cause than it does for the Palestinian. Here was a people, at least 30 million strong, denied its own independent state of Kurdistan by four occupying powers; Iraq, Iran, Syria and Turkey, one that had been the victim of repeated and atrocious persecutions, verging at times on genocide, and constantly subject to policies designed to eradicate Kurdish language and culture. But the problem here was that the Kurd's enemies were not Jews, but Arabs and Muslims. In view of the decades of persecution that the Kurds have endured and always resisted, it is no

surprise that Mohammed Ihsan, a prominent Kurdish politician, put it rather bluntly when he made it clear that ‘one thing for certain is that the Kurds of Iraq will never allow themselves to be ruled by Arabs, be they Sunni or Shi’a.’ As in the case of the Jordanian Palestinians, there is not the remotest possibility of the Arab League, the OIC, the United Nations or any Middle Eastern state responding sympathetically to the demand for Kurdish independence. And today, that is also, for this very reason, true of the Sharia left, for whom the Kurds are, in a total reversal of the traditional left-wing policy of support for their independence, in the judgement of the Socialist Workers Party, ‘western pawns’. The Kurdish case today is not helped by the fact that they are not Arabs, a deficiency compounded by their being the least Islamic and most religiously diverse of all the Middle Eastern peoples, and for that reason, the most tolerant and the most secular. To cap it all, the Kurds have a long tradition of militant leftist politics, which has in its turn encouraged the growth of a powerful feminist movement, with units comprised entirely of emancipated women fighting a war to the death against the rapist savages of the ISIS Caliphate.

Secularist, socialist, even feminist, the Kurds have few if any allies in the Arab or Muslim worlds. Why this is the case is easily understood in the context of Middle Eastern politics...but why does the left share this at best indifference, and at worst, hostility, to the Kurdish cause, when, on paper at least, it shares so many of their values? In addition to the reasons above, it is because the only material external support, little as it was, that the Kurds received in their resistance to the Islamic State, came from the west, in the first place from the United States, in its belated and half-hearted response to the rise of the ISIS Caliphate. After the first Iraq war of 1991, similar support, again belatedly and reluctantly, was given to the Kurds in the western attempt to contain and destabilise the genocidal regime of Saddam Hussein, whose answer to the Kurdish ‘problem’ was gassing and mass deportations. These and many other no less atrocious crimes did not prevent the far left from rallying to the fascist Ba’athist regime both then and in the second Iraq war of 2003. Capping all of the Kurds’ sins is their relationship with Israel, the only state which publicly supports their demand for national independence. In return, the Kurds look to Israel as their most reliable ally. In the words of a veteran of the Kurdish resistance to Saddam Hussein, ‘the Kurds have only trust in Israel’.

A similar policy to that pursued in the Iraq wars towards the Kurds was subsequently promoted, following the emergence of ISIS, by the main UK far leftist sect, the Socialist Workers Party, which had advocated support for ‘Islamism’, the ‘militant’ version of Islam, as the only answer to the predations of western imperialism. Consistent with this policy, together with other smaller groups, the party opposed any western support whatsoever for the Kurdish resistance to ISIS in north Iraq and Syria, just as it did for Ukraine in its resistance to the Russian invasion of 2022. (See Appendix XIV) According to the *Socialist Worker* of August 19, 2014, ‘western intervention will only prolong the fighting’. (Corbyn used exactly the same words to oppose western military aid to Ukraine.) Yes, it did. But that is exactly why the Kurds, like Ukraine, were requesting military help from the west...precisely in order to ‘prolong the fighting’, because the only alternative was a rapid ‘Islamist’, ISIS victory, the outcome obviously desired by the SWP, followed by unimaginable carnage, just as the same results would have ensued had NATO acted on Corbyn’s demand. The Kurds, so it seemed, were wrong to resist the ‘Islamism’ of ISIS. They did not see the ‘bigger picture’...the

need for unity in opposition, not to ISIS, but to western imperialism. Any weapons and food the west dropped to the Kurds should have presumably been left to rust and rot in the sand. Better that ISIS won, butchering, crucifying, beheading, raping, burying alive, than the Kurds should compromise themselves in the eyes of the left by receiving western arms, food and medical supplies that could be used, for example, by the Kurdish women's brigade, to drive back the ISIS Jihadis. By accepting 'imperialist' military aid, the Kurds became, quote, 'western pawns', just like the Ukrainians. And in the SWP's book, there was no greater crime than this. Certainly not genocide. It took real courage to make such a principled stand, even if it was from the safety of a London editorial office.

The malicious charge that the Kurds were 'pawns' of western imperialism could not have been further from the truth. Even though they were the only serious obstacle to the further expansion of ISIS, in July 2015, following a succession of victories for Kurdish forces over those of the Islamic State, President Obama blocked their supplies of military hardware from surrounding Arab states. Anxious not to antagonise his Turkish NATO partners, virtually in a state of war against the country's substantial Kurdish minority, Obama's policy, like the west's generally, had been from the outset one of 'containment' of ISIS, not its elimination. On June 8, 2015, after more than a year of Islamic State expansion and its accompanying atrocities, Obama admitted that (apart from denying weapons to its most formidable foes) he still had 'no strategy yet' for combating the Islamic State. A decisive Kurdish victory over the Islamic State leading to the assertion of Kurdish nationhood at the expense of not only Syria, Iraq and a potentially nuclear Iran, but Obama's NATO ally, was evidently not on Washington's agenda any more than it was that of the Sharia left.

Obama's treacherous decision to block arms supplies to the Kurds was clearly in response to Turkey President Erdogan's announcement 'to the whole world' on June 26, following a series of Kurdish victories over Islamic State forces, that his government 'will never allow a [Kurdish] state to be founded in north Syria, south of our border.' A month later, in the wake of the Islamic State massacre of Kurdish socialist youth at Sures, Turkish (and therefore NATO) jets began bombing Kurdish forces fighting ISIS, not in 'north Syria', but in the western-protected Kurdish autonomous zone of northern Iraq. There were no protests from the White House at this treacherous assault, or from the Sharia left. Washington's betrayal of the Kurds was complete when, in October 2019, an isolationist President Trump announced the withdrawal of all US forces from northern Syria (as he did from Afghanistan in 2020, with identical results) in the certain knowledge that the Kurds would be subjected to the combined assaults of Presidents Assad of Syria and Erdogan of Turkey. (A similar cynical *realpolitik* informed President Clinton's reluctance to check Russian-backed Serbian expansionism in the Balkan wars of the 1990s.) And finally, following Biden's election victory in 2020, came the greatest betrayal of all, his implementing a previous decision by Trump to withdraw all US forces from Afghanistan, in the full realisation that doing so would result in the return to power of the Taliban and the subjection of Afghan women to theocratic enslavement. A YouTube video that reached the west shortly after the announcement of Biden's pull-out provided a glimpse of the misogynistic prison that awaited them when it was completed. It showed and recorded a woman, surrounded by an audience of men, begging for mercy as she received forty lashes after being apprehended in Taliban territory talking to a man on her smart phone.

Barbaric, you will say. But quisling feminists will reply, who are we to impose our culture on men who do not share it?

Realpolitik, though on a far more modest scale, also informed the selective outrage...or rather in this case the lack of it...in the leftist response to the Kremlin's two wars against Islamic nations. First came the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, launched to protect their beleaguered puppet regime in Kabul. Ten years later, with the USSR on its last legs, the Kremlin admitted defeat and withdrew its forces, leaving behind an estimated one million dead civilians, another three million maimed, and one third of those who survived being driven into exile in Iran and Pakistan. (A total of 620,000 Soviet military took part in the operation, of which 14,500 were killed.) No leftist organisation demonstrated against these truly atrocious crimes, or accused the Kremlin of committing genocide, despite the huge disparity in forces and casualties. That charge would be reserved only for use against Israel. The silence (and therefore the complicity) of the left is easily explained. As was the case in Bosnia and Kosovo against the Russian-backed Serbs, the USA was also providing military hardware to the Islamic resistance to Russia in Afghanistan, and therefore to campaign against the Soviet invasion and occupation would be to take the west's side in the cold war.

The same opportunistic considerations applied during Russia's two wars against the overwhelmingly Islamic 'Autonomous' (sic) Republic of Chechnya, even though now the USSR was no more, and had been replaced by the Russian Federation and a number of other successor states. Surely, since the Kremlin was now in no sense 'socialist', here was a cause to bring together the left and Muslims onto the streets to protest an onslaught, first by Yeltsin and then Putin, that out of a total population of less than a million, left at least 150,000 Chechen civilians dead and forced another 350,000 into exile...over half the population. Though genocide was not the purpose of the two wars, their results, unlike those of Israeli military actions against Hamas, certainly resembled it. Yet Russia suffered no condemnation at the hands of the UN, where it can exercise the right of veto on the 'Security Council', or the 'Human Rights' Council, where Russia can always be sure of the support of a majority of anti-western delegations. Muslims and leftists were indeed busy demonstrating at the time of both wars...but not against them. The target of the 'Stop the War' protests was the series of western military operations which finally removed the fascist Saddam regime in Iraq and the Taliban theocracy in Afghanistan.

Those who naively look to the United Nations, and in the first place, its Human Rights Council, for the upholding of civilised standards of behaviour within and between its member states first need to take cognisance of certain key facts. All 57 members of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (sic...two of its leading members, Sunni Saudi Arabia and Shi'a Iran, were for years not conferring but in a state of proxy holy war in Yemen) in 1990, at their Cairo conference, explicitly repudiated, on the grounds of its secularity, the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Despite this repudiation, all 57 members of the IOC, with the exception of the Palestinian Authority, are eligible to serve by rota on the 47 member UN Human Rights Council where, together with other third world representatives, they effectively comprise and function as a generally anti-western, and specifically anti-Israel bloc, operating in a manner identical to the Kremlin bloc before the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989. Bearing in mind that Council members are elected for a three-year term by a UN General Assembly in which only a small minority

pays more than lip service to the principles upon which it was founded, the result has been that in all its 17 years of existence as of 2023, states that as matter of principle, routinely flout UN resolutions on human rights, have exerted a controlling influence in the Council, most of all when the item on the agenda is the Middle East. (See Appendix II) Consequently, one country has never been elected to serve on the Council, and will not be for the foreseeable future. I leave it to the reader to name it.

The Council bloc vote arrangement, in which members agree in advance not to criticise each other for human rights abuses, was highlighted in September 2015, when, in the same week that Saudi Arabia was, ludicrously, appointed by this same Human Rights Council to head the powerful UN Human Rights Consultative Group, a five-member body that appoints those responsible for monitoring and reporting global human rights abuses, Obama's royal ally in the fight against 'extremism' announced to the world that it intended to behead and posthumously crucify Saudi Human Rights campaigner Ali Mohammed al-Nimr, after extracting from him under torture a false confession of firearms possession. Because of the composition of this bogus UN Human Rights Council, it spends most of its time and energies attacking Israel for fictitious human rights crimes, while conspiring to protect each other from accusations of abuses that are all too real. For example, when an accredited representative of an Israeli Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) attempted to deliver a scheduled report to the Council on human rights violations committed by Hamas during the Gaza conflict of 2014, he was prevented from doing so by an obviously pre-arranged and unrelenting barrage of interruptions and spurious points of order, delivered with the collusion of the Council's chairperson. However, when the subject under review was alleged Israeli human rights violations in the same conflict, everything went like clockwork. There was no heckling, spurious points of order or procedural wranglings, with the result that when put to the vote, a resolution condemning only Israel for human rights violations in the Gaza war was passed by 41 votes to the United States' single vote against, with India, Kenya, Ethiopia, Paraguay and Macedonia abstaining.

Consider the following example of how the Islamic states co-ordinate their affairs when they feel their interests and reputations are at stake. In 1997, a report to the United Nations Human Rights Council on racism presented by the Benin delegate contained a section titled 'Islamist and Arab Anti-Semitism'. The section in question referred to the fact that 'Muslim extremists are turning increasingly to their own religious sources, first and foremost the *Koran*, as a primary anti-Jewish source'. This of course was true at the time and is even more so today. But as the promoters of this Koranic anti-Semitism, the Islamic states in question were having none of it. Speaking on behalf of all 57 members of the IOC, the Indonesian delegate to the Council rejected the report's 'offensive reference to Islam and the Holy *Koran*' and demanded that it be removed, which it duly was. But this was not enough. At a subsequent session of the UN's Economic and Social Council, the Indonesian delegate, again speaking on behalf of the OIC, complained of the 'outrageous reference to Islam and to the *Koran*'. Relentless lobbying by Islamic states finally succeeded in securing the removal, not only of the offending passage, but the entire section of the report which contained it. Thus, the Religion of Peace.

Whenever Israel is the target for accusations, however groundless, the outcome is certain, because it is fixed in advance by an anti-Zionist cabal which even India, itself a target for Muslim terrorism, feels unable to challenge openly. Yet Iran has

never been taken to task for its executions of gays and Kurds, Saudi Arabia for its abuse of women, promotion of anti-Semitism, and persecution of Christians, China for its rape of Tibet and Sin Kiang,, the 57 Islamic states for their denial of free religion, speech and press, or North Korea for just about everything, all of which and more violates the UN's Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Israel, on the other hand, which commits none of these crimes, has been condemned on no fewer than 61 occasions for human rights abuses, more half the number of all such rulings, totalling 116, made by the Council in its entire history. Bearing in mind that the number of UN member states stands currently at 193, if we are to believe the UN Human Rights Council, Israel, with a Jewish population of seven million, 0.1% of the world's total population, is responsible for 55% of all human rights abuses committed on a planet with a population of 7.5 billion. This will be confirmation for those Muslim's brainwashed by their clergy that the World Jewish Conspiracy revealed to them in the *Protocols* is as active now as ever, since less than one thousandth of the world's population, Israel's Jews, commits over half of all human rights abuses, all against Muslims, while human rights-respecting Muslims states, with a combined population of one and a half billion, commit none.

In effect, the Human Rights Council has been converted, with the tacit consent of its parent body, the UN General Assembly, into a global Sharia court whose sole function is to heap slander upon the Jews. These attacks are permanently built into the Council's procedural agenda, item number seven, which at each of its three annual sessions, is devoted solely to the alleged human rights crimes of Israel. In the General Assembly, where the same anti-Israel majority operates, in just one year, 2014, the anti-Zionist bloc secured the passing of 20 resolutions condemning Israel. Yet one of the leading members of that bloc, Iran, escaped censure when its political and 'spiritual' leaders, loudly and regularly, proclaimed their intention to 'wipe off the map' another member of the UN, Israel. Were such a threat to be made against any other state, we can be sure that the UN General Assembly's response would be swift and punitive, as it was when Russia was the aggressor against Ukraine. What kind of organisation is it then that allows one of its members to issue what amounts to death threats against another, and moreover furnishes material assistance to two armed movements, Hamas and Hezbollah, that are effectively in a state of war with that other member, and, moreover, not only seek its destruction, but also the murder of all its Jewish citizens?

Israel is not only routinely and ritually convicted by the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council of crimes against Palestinians. It has even been blamed for crimes committed by Palestinians on Palestinians, specifically by Palestinian men who, also as a matter of routine and as their religion recommends, beat their wives. This was the gist of a report delivered in January 2015 by UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay. Her report would lead anyone not familiar with its sanctioning by the *Koran* (Chapter 4, Verse 34) to believe that wife beating by Palestinian Muslims has nothing to do with their religion, but a great deal to do with what the report called 'the combination of decades of Israel occupation, the use of force against Palestinians by Israel' and what she described as 'the different forms of resistance used by the Palestinians against such use of force'. So wife beating is a 'form of resistance' to Zionism? In which case, surely, carry on beating. This, from the female UN High Commissioner of Human Rights. To prove her case, she would have required irrefutable statistical evidence that prior to the Israeli occupation of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank in June 1967,

Palestinian men in those territories had beaten their wives no more frequently, and with no more force, than was normal in other Islamic states, and that the frequency of these beatings not only increased following the Israeli occupation, but was caused by it. We should also expect, if the claim is true, that the frequency of wife beatings in the Gaza Strip had over time settled back to its pre-occupation level following the total Israeli withdrawal from that territory in 2005. But the report provided no such evidence and no such proof, any more than it even so much as alluded to the Koranic verse and the numerous *Hadith* that approve of this vile practice, for example *Sahih Muslim* 4:2127, *Bukhari* 8:82:828 and *Abu Dawud*. 11:2139-42. This report did not go unchallenged, though as one has learned to expect, not by *dhimmi* western feminists. Hillel Neuer, executive director of UN Watch, rejected the report's anti-Zionist alibi for Palestinian misogyny and male brutality: 'Blaming Israel for what Palestinian men do to their wives is not only unsustainable in logic; it is cruel and immoral for the victims.' And it is also refuted by all the surveys that have been conducted in the Muslim world on the subject of wife beating. In Jordan, which is not under Israeli occupation, and half of whose population is comprised of Palestinians, 91% of *university students*, when questioned by the Jordan Human Rights Centre, said they approved of wife beating. And yet on reflection, why should this be any cause for surprise, seeing that university students are certain to be far more conversant with the texts of their faith that sanction wife beating than any other segment of the Jordanian male population (See Addendum to Appendix II for more details on the *modus operandi* of the UN Human Rights Council)

The destiny of Islam, so we are told, is to one day rule the entire globe. But it seems that this irresistible force does not imbue its devotees with the kind of resoluteness and clarity of purpose that should accompany this conviction. Like corks bobbing on ocean waves, young Muslim men, far more than those of other faiths or none, are likely at the smallest or even imagined provocation to lose all control over their actions, and are transformed, willy-nilly, into rampaging mindless mobs, suicide bombers, assassins, executioners, rapists and pimps by (so we are told) a western government's foreign policies and, without doubt, by a cartoon, a play, the publication of a book or magazine or, as in this case, into wife beaters by Israeli military occupations. If this is really so, as the UN report would like us to believe, then in his own way, the Muslim wife beater is as much a victim (of the Jews) if not more so, than the beaten wife is of her husband. He loves his wife, and naturally doesn't want to beat her, but somehow, day after day, he finds himself doing just that...all because of the Jews. At least he, if not his wife, has the comfort of Ms. Navi Pillay reassuring him that it is not his fault, that the cause lies, like all the other problems of the Arab world, with the Jews, and that in fact, his wife beatings could be seen as a novel form of 'resistance' to Israel occupation. Here we see the fruits of the cultural relativist, but also implicitly racist, assumption that peoples of non-western cultures, in this instance that of Arab Islam, cannot, and in fact should not, be expected to conform to the norms of behaviour that are demanded, if not always observed, in the west. This, I repeat, from the female United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Al-Monitor, a news agency that collects and publishes data concerned with Middle Eastern affairs, reported the following example of Palestinian wife beating which, if the UN report is correct, should be attributed to actions by Israel. 'My husband did not like what I cooked for diner, so he punched me in the face, injuring my eye. I often get severely beaten for

trivial reasons. He even allows his mother and sisters to hit me during familial disagreements.' Evidently they too were resisting Zionist occupation.

This low farce of allowing persistent human rights abusers to wage their relentless vendetta against Israel to the exclusion of all other concerns is greatly facilitated by the partisan appointment of full-time UN and Human Rights Council staff, of which Navi Pillay is a prime example. Aside from the regular appointment to key posts of Muslims from states that violate and reject the UN's own Declaration of Universal Human Rights, we also have the case that closely resembles that of the Nazi Storm Trooper and Wehrmacht army officer who, with Soviet bloc and Arab/Muslim backing, was appointed UN Secretary General, the infamous Kurt Waldheim. Then there was Herman Klenner, like Waldheim a Nazi who at the end of the war effortlessly underwent a metamorphosis, only this time into a born-again Stalinist and then, via the Kremlin's puppet East German diplomatic service, to the post of Vice President of the United Nations Human Rights Commission based in Geneva. There, as a former employee of two anti-Semites, Hitler and Stalin, he sat in judgement on human rights violations supposedly committed by the Jews of Israel.

Just as the Kremlin's savage repressions and atrocities in Muslim Afghanistan and Chechnya escaped condemnation in the UN, so they did on the street. In total contrast to the actions unleashed by the pro-Hamas mobs during the Gaza conflict of 2014, for the duration of the Afghan and Chechen wars, despite the huge scale of civilian casualties, casualties that dwarfed those sustained in Gaza, there were no chants of 'Russian baby killers', no 'We are all Chechens', no storming of Orthodox churches, Soviet or Russian embassies, or other buildings and properties in any way connected with Russia. Russians living in the west went about their lives unmolested. It was business as usual, as the Kremlin attended to yet another spot of bother in its own back yard. Nor was there any talk of a Russian 'disproportionate response' to Chechnya's declaration of independence after the collapse of the USSR in 1991, even though the full weight of Russia's land and air forces were hurled against the near-defenceless, minuscule republic. Neither was anyone remotely interested in the huge discrepancy in the causality figures. In the Afghan war, the USSR suffered 14,500 dead; in Chechnya, Russian dead were in the region of 10,000. Chechen casualties, nearly all civilian, were at least 150,000, while, as already mentioned, those of the Afghans totalled around one million. Yet Afghanistan only became an issue for diaspora Muslims and the left when Western military support enabled the Northern Alliance to remove the Palaeolithic Taliban theocracy that harboured Bin Laden, with both taking the side of the Taliban.

There was a similar indifference to the human cost of Islamic civil wars that set the Middle East ablaze in the wake of the so-called Arab Spring. After four years of military conflict in Syria, costing an estimated 220,000 lives, the emergence of the ISIS 'caliphate' in 2014 marked a new stage in the age-old rivalry between Sunni and Shi'a. Given the level of the stakes, which were nothing less than the right to speak in the name of world Islam, it was only a matter of time before the two leading contestants confronted each other, the Sunni Saudis and the Shi'a Iranians. The Sunni ISIS onslaughts against the Shi'a Ba'athist regime in Syria and the Shi'a-based government in Iraq demanded a response from Tehran, and it duly came. The Ayatollahs first dispatched their 'Revolutionary Guards' and the surrogate Hezbollah to shore up their Syrian Ba'athist allies, and then, in a direct challenge to the Saudis, urged on the Shi'a Houthis to overthrow the US-backed Sunni regime in

Yemen. The Saudis replied with bombing raids after the Houthis routed the Yemen government's demoralised army and swept down from the capital Sana'a to seize Aden, the strategic port on the Red Sea. Iran then dispatched two warships to Aden to lend more support to their Houthi proxies. In Aden itself the corpses piled up yet again as Muslim fought Muslim and Muslim bombed Muslim, provoking Iran's 'Spiritual Leader' Ayatollah Khamenei to make this accusation against the Saudis on April 9, 2015: 'This is a crime and a genocide that can be prosecuted in international [sic - that is, infidel] courts'. More such atrocities followed, climaxed on October 9, 2016 by the Saudi bombing of a Houthi funeral in Sana'a which left 160 dead and another 500 wounded. Why no 'Stop the War Coalition' protests outside the Saudi embassy? Why no calls for a boycott of and sanctions on the Saudi 'genocidists'? By now, the reader should know the answer.

Israel, as we all know, is accused *ad nauseam* of committing genocide against the Palestinians, a charge that is not only a lie, but is known to be so by those who make it. Yet the one real act of genocide committed in the Middle East, and which conformed exactly to its definition by international law, was Saddam Hussein's onslaught on the Kurds between 1986 and 1989. Code-named *Al Anfal*, after the eighth chapter of the *Koran*, 'The Spoils of War,' the campaign's purpose was to crush the Kurdish movement for national independence. It climaxed on March 18, 1988, with the gassing of thousands of civilians at Halabja. In all, one million Kurds were forcibly deported to areas far from their homeland. The killings and deportations were on such a scale as to warrant their definition as genocide by the International Criminal Court in The Hague, but not by the UN or its bogus 'Human Rights' council, and certainly not by the left and its Muslim allies, who were only stirred into action by the prospect of Saddam's removal from power when, following Saddam's invasion and rape of Kuwait in August 1990, a US-led force was mobilised to liberate it. Now, with Saddam's genocidal regime in danger, Iraq suddenly mattered. The far left, together with diaspora Muslims, counter-mobilised in Saddam's defence, behind the slogan 'Victory to Iraq'. Kurdish and Kuwaiti Muslims, it seemed, could be massacred with impunity, because other Muslims were doing the killing. Only when the West became involved, very late in the day it must be said, to first curb and then remove those responsible, did the killing of Muslims, the soldiers of a regime guilty of genocide, become a cause for protest.

None other than Corbyn himself provided one of the most flagrant examples of leftist double standards when, with the outbreak of renewed hostilities between Israel and Hamas, on May 10, 2021, he featured as the main speaker at the first of a series of Palestine Solidarity Campaign demonstrations held at the entrance to Downing Street, thankfully, not from within it. His first major rally since the calamitous general election campaign of 2019, this time, the message was not 'for the many, not the few', but for Hamas, not the Jew. This was because the rally had been called to protest against Israel's military response to more than a thousand rockets fired by Hamas from Gaza civilian locations into Israeli urban areas, killing six civilians. Some 200 other Hamas rockets landed in Gaza territory, killing its own civilians. This renewal of hostilities by Hamas against Israel had the wholehearted support of its Shi'a Islam quartermaster and Corbyn's former employer, Iran. A message of solidarity from a military commander in Tehran heralded a 'new era in the conflict with the Zionist enemy' and vowed that 'we will never be satisfied until [Israel] is removed from the blessed land of Palestine and the liberation of every grain of its soil.' This was followed by a tweet with an identical

message from Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, to the Hamas leader, Ismail Haniyeh, one in which, as Iran's head of state, by inciting others to destroy the state of Israel, he violated (as on previous identical occasions, with impunity) Chapter 1, Article 2, item 4 of the United Nations Charter: 'All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.' The Ayatollah's message read: 'By God's power, you will be victorious and purify the Holy Land from the contamination of the usurpers, God willing.' Article Seven of the Hamas Covenant goes further, much further. The ultimate goal of Corbyn's 'friends' is not just the elimination of Israel, and not even of its seven million Jews, but *the extermination of every Jew on our planet*: 'The day of judgment will not come until Muslims fight the Jews, killing the Jews, when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees. The stones and the trees will say, "O Muslims, O Abdullah, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him."' So much for the 'two state solution'. So much for the religion of peace. And so much for peace campaigner Corbyn's 'friends'.

Support for the Hamas genocidal war against Israel was also forthcoming at the rally by Black Lives Matter activist Joshua Virasami. Without explaining how or why, he revealed to his audience that 'in the liberation of Palestine [the standard euphuism for the destruction of Israel] lies the freedom of black people'. Was he saying that the UK's blacks were not free? And, if so, that their 'freedom' required the destruction of a Jewish state 3,600 kilometers distant? Given BLM's stance on Israel (it accuses Israel of both genocide and apartheid) one suspects that he saw the rally as one more opportunity to slander Jews, as it did over the murder of George Floyd, which it lyingly attributed to his killer, Derek Chauvin, having been trained in Israeli police techniques. (BLM's foreign policy invariably follows the same Chomskyan grooves etched out over the decades by the rest of the far left. Its response to the repression of massive anti-regime demonstrations across Cuba in July 2021 was a statement by its shadowy 'Global Network Foundation' claiming that 'the people of Cuba are being punished by the US government [sic] because the country has maintained its commitment to sovereignty and self-determination', implying that the protests were in some way not directed against the Cuban regime, but 'Washington's' embargo policy, even though many of the demonstrators, some of whom were black, carried US flags.)

Back in London, the mood and purpose of the anti-Israel demonstration was also captured by flags and posters on display, only here, racist, Jew-baiting hyperbole ran riot. One poster made the by now routine direct comparison between the Nazi genocide of the Jews (which of course many Muslims either celebrate or deny and who knows, some both) and a mythical Jewish genocide of the Palestinians. Among others with the same message, one held up by a child, said 'Zionists = Nazis', an all too familiar setting for a Corbyn diatribe against Israel. If only for tactical reasons, comparison with, and not praise for the Nazis was the order of the day in London, a restraint not always exercised when on-line. A matter of days after the cease-fire brokered by Egypt between Israel and Hamas came into effect on May 22, 2021, it was revealed that a BBC journalist, Tala Halawa, back in 2014, at the time of a previous Hamas-Israel conflict, had tweeted 'Hitler was right'. Across the Atlantic, another Muslim journalist, Adeel Raja Hussain, a CNN broadcaster, expressed a similar sentiment when he tweeted during the May 2021 re-run of the 2014 war, 'the world needs another Hitler,' a wish shared by a posting on, of all

locations, a Holocaust survivor's website, which read: 'We need a Hitler to deal with Zionists who occupy some else's land.' For obvious reasons, neither do tactical considerations apply in the Arab world, where Hitler is a hero. One can view on MEMRI TV, which monitors Arab TV channels, any number of Palestinian broadcasts praising the chief architect of the Holocaust, as one can of children being coached to emulate him 'when they grow up'.

As on a similar occasion in 2014, the rally was graced by the presence of a real-life Nazi, Lady Michèle Renouf. No less a zealous anti-Zionist than the rally's leftist organizers and speakers, in 2001 her ladyship chose Holocaust Memorial Day to insert into the Personal Column of *The Times* an announcement that read: 'On Holocaust Day, remember their [the Jews'] 3.5 million Palestinian refugees.' (There were not then, and are not now, and never have been 3.5 million Palestinian 'refugees' from Israel.) Support for the Hamas cause could even be found in the ranks of the forces of law and order. One of the police officers on duty at the rally, PC Nusheen, was later under investigation for misconduct. She had been videoed chanting 'free Palestine', hugging a demonstrator and saying that as an Iraqi, she supported the protests. Another police officer was also under investigation for ignoring clearly audible death threats made against Jews attending a pro-Israel rally in London on May 23. One counter-demonstrator was filmed and recorded shouting 'we want the Zionists; we want their blood' within earshot of a police officer who took no action. As was to be expected, large numbers of Muslims were present at these and all subsequent London events. Among them were those whose gleeful burning of Israeli flags outside the Israeli embassy conjured up images redolent of a Tsar-era Russian pogrom.

A week after the Downing Street demo, a Religion of Peace convoy of around 200 cars flying Palestinian flags arrived in London, many from anti-Israel zealot Labour MP Naz Shah's Bradford West constituency, to attend another pro-Hamas rally, again addressed by Corbyn. (In a reprise of his Glastonbury glory days, the veteran anti-Zionist was greeted by flowers and the chant of 'Oh, Jeremy Corbyn' from his cultic devotees and, as a bonus, another by the denizens of Allah; 'Jews, the army of Mohammed is coming'.) *En route* to savoring Corbyn's oratory, the Muslim car convoy took a detour through Jewish areas of north London, hurling anti-Semitic abuse at passers-by. Occupants of one of the cars were recorded chanting 'Fuck the Jews, fuck their daughters, fuck their mothers, rape their daughters'. No surprise there. Yorkshire, including Bradford, has had more than its fair share of Muslim rape gang convictions. (See Chapter 27) All four were later arrested.

At a third pro-Hamas rally in London a week later, posters on display included many praising Hamas as 'freedom fighters', and among others with a specifically anti-Semitic message, one of Jesus carrying his crucifixion cross with the legend 'Do not let them [the Jews] do the same thing today'. (This was pre-Vatican II vintage Catholic Jew-baiting. While still endorsing the Biblical tradition that 'Jewish authorities and those that followed their lead pressed for the death of Jesus Christ', even the Catholic Church had repudiated 'the ancient charge of collective Jewish guilt for the death of Jesus' in a ruling of the Second Vatican Council, dated October 14-15, 1965. Contrary to what the poster implied, Mathew 27: 35, Mark 15:15, Luke 23: 25, John 19:16 say that acting on the order of Pontius Pilate, the Romans crucified Jesus, not the Jews, while as it says in its Covenant, Article Seven, it is Hamas that wants to exterminate the Jews, not the Israeli Jews the

Palestinians.) In an exercise in anti-Zionist maths, another poster claimed that Israel Prime Minister Netanyahu had 'surpass[ed] Hitler in barbarism'. In the course of their ten-day rocket onslaught on Israel, even Hamas claimed to have suffered less than 300 fatal casualties, many of them known to be combatants. Confining ourselves to the Holocaust, Hitler was responsible for the death of 6 million Jewish civilians 20,000 times more. Exploring the same theme, another poster revealed that 'the Nazis are still around' only 'they call themselves Zionists now'.

At each succeeding rally, the posters underwent two changes, evolving from largely home-made to standardised ones that were obviously products of a burgeoning anti-Zionist cottage industry, and also becoming more virulently and explicitly anti-Jewish. By the time of the fifth London rally on July 3, from the speaker's rostrum, Corbyn would have seen two professionally-produced posters, both with a Hitler mustache superimposed on a photo of Netanyahu. One proclaimed that 'Israel is a Nazi State', and the other, that 'Zionism Equals Nazism'. More than 90% of the world's Jews are Zionists, that is, whatever their views on other issues concerning Israeli politics, they support the existence of the state of Israel. So, as being a Zionist makes a Jew a Nazi, both *a fortiori* and *ipso facto*, it also makes them genocidal anti-Semites, taking turns to drive each other into Israel's gas chambers.

Top of the bill at this anti-Jewish hate fest was, inevitably, anti-racist campaigner Comrade Corbyn, with support acts from fellow Zionist-baiting Labour MPs John McDonnell and Richard Burgon, and 60's student protestor and Brexiteer Tariq Ali, who, like Paul Foot of the SWP's *Socialist Worker*, in his speech attributed anti-Semitism to the behavior of Jews, specifically, Israeli ones. Nothing original there. So did Hitler, only his Jews were Austrian, one of a number of instances we shall encounter in this work of the political extremes converging when the subject is the 'Jewish question'. When McDonnell told a rally held the day after the cease-fire that 'there will be no cease-fire in our campaign to boycott, disinvest and sanction the Israeli apartheid state', this diatribe by one of Labour's anti-Zionist old-guard was echoed at the same rally from within Keir Starmer's supposedly post-Corbyn Shadow Cabinet by a former suspendee for anti-Semitism, Labour MP for Bradford West and shadow minister for Communities Cohesion (sic) Naz Shah. The cease-fire, she said, 'does not stop Israel committing the crime of apartheid'. (As always with this accusation, no evidence was forthcoming to substantiate it.) Although this lie contravened her party's official stance on combatting anti-Semitism, it passed without reprimand, let alone suspension, unlike on two previous occasions in 2016 when she made similar anti-Semitic comments that led to the withdrawal of the Labour whip, despite Corbyn's attempts to protect her. Back in her home town, nursing her own constituents, more than 50% of whom were Muslims, she addressed another pro-Hamas rally, accusing Israel of deliberately killing children, again without any negative repercussions from her party, even though a speaker sharing the platform with Shah demanded a *Jihad* against the Jews, calling on Allah to 'make us all mujahideen in Palestine', to 'lift the curse of the Jews off the Muslims in Palestine' and 'make Islam win'. So much for Starmer's 'zero tolerance of anti-Semitism.'

One suspects that her apparent immunity could have had something to do with her role as Labour's Muslim poster girl for much-needed Muslim votes. Instead of playing to Muslim anti-Semitism by telling lies about Jewish 'baby killers', Shah would have been better employed as Labour's Shadow Minister for Communities

Cohesion by holding to account those responsible for the administration of her constituency's child protection services. In a report released on July 28, 2021, replicating what had been occurred, in Rotherham and Manchester (See Chapter 27), they were accused of, quote, 'collusion', over a period of at least two decades, in the criminal sexual exploitation of vulnerable children in their care by men sharing Shah's religion. The crimes included not only the usual child rape, but forced child marriages. Both should have been of special concern to Shah, because the trials of their perpetrators occurred when she was serving as Corbyn's shadow Minister for Women (sic) and Equalities. Yet it was then that she displayed at best her indifference to the sexual abuse of children by Muslim men when she 'liked' *and shared* a spoof tweet which said, 'those abused girls in Rotherham and elsewhere need to shut their mouths. For the good of diversity.' (While her anti-Semitic party leader allowed the scandal to pass without comment, Equality and Human Rights Commission Chief Executive Rebecca Hilsenrath said that Shah 'should know better', that 'diversity is not served by silence'.)

It is hard to credit that Bradford-born and bred Shah had no inkling of the scale of sexual depravity within her own constituency's Muslim 'community', especially when it became a subject of media comment and reporting with a series of trials and convictions of some (but far from all) of those engaged in it. As I write, new trials are pending, including of a large number of accused from Shah's home town and constituency. On July 7 and 9, 2021, 29 (yes, 29) men appeared at Bradford magistrate's court charged with a number of sexual offences, some against a 13-year-old girl. All 29 had Muslim names. More arrests followed on July 30, this time of 38 men (yes, 38) and two women (sic), once again, some from Bradford, in connection with the sexual abuse of nine female children, and again on July 4, when 19, men, this time, *all from Bradford*, were arrested on charges of the sexual abuse of a girl. While the majority of those charged in these three cases were from Bradford, some of the remainder were from Batley, where four months previously, (male) Muslim protests at a school's gates led to the suspension of and then death threats to a school teacher for showing to his class a cartoon of Mohammed in a lesson on free speech and blasphemy. It seems that for some Muslim men, raping a child does not rank as a crime, while showing a cartoon of their prophet (who had sexual intercourse with his last wife when she was aged nine) merits the death penalty.

While it would be wrong to prejudge the outcome of these cases (87 in all) if the verdicts prove to be the same as those in previous trials of Bradford Muslims involving the same or similar offences, (they did...in June 2024, 25 Muslim men were jailed for a total of 364 years for 'abhorrent' sex offences), it will be no exaggeration to say that Shah's home town has a serious problem with the sexual conduct of a considerable number of its adult male Muslims. However, going on her past form with regard to this issue, and her fixation on mythical Jewish baby killers rather than concern for the victims of proven Muslim child rape in her own back yard, I do not expect that Shah will share that judgment. As always, there is the 'big picture'...in this instance, the Muslim vote. 51% of Shah's constituency of Bradford West is Muslim, second only to Birmingham Hodge Hill's 52%

A matter of days after her speech in London accusing Israel, contrary to Labour policy, of apartheid, for the first time in the entire 73-year history of Israel, a Palestinian party, the 'Joint List', evidently unconvinced by tales of a Zionist genocide (and segregation) of their fellow Palestinians, together with the Israeli

Labour Party, joined a new anti-Netanyahu government coalition in her 'apartheid' Israel. It must have seemed as if not only the fates, but Allah himself was conspiring to make a laughing stock of her, because this was followed by a review in the *Daily Mail* on June 5 of a book authored by a fellow Muslim, Ed Hussain, on the subject of apartheid. But it was not about Shah's fictitious apartheid in Israel, but an all too real Islamic one in the UK and, here is the rub, at its most extreme, in Shah's very own Bradford constituency where, to quote the review, 'Muslim parents have banned children from taking part in drama, theatre and art classes as well as drawing, in echoes of rules implemented by the Taliban in Afghanistan and ISIS [i.e., the Islamic State] in Syria.'

In Bradford as in other northern cities, said Hussain, 'a Muslim can spend months with no contact whatsoever with mainstream "white" Britain'...and, but for the fact that it was by choice, just like non-whites with whites in pre-Mandela South Africa. 'They are living in Britain but mentally living elsewhere.' Hussain asked a Bradford Muslim taxi driver where all the whites had gone. 'Gone with the wind' was the reply. So much for multi-culturalism and 'community cohesion', Shah's ministerial brief. Their 'white flight' was not a totally voluntary process. Islamic apartheid in Naz Shah's Bradford, as in other northern cities, is enforced by the creation of 'no-go' areas policed by male Muslim vigilantes who are prepared to and, as Hussain relates, do use violence to keep their territory *kuffar*-free. The Muslim 'quarter' of Bradford (in Shah's constituency be it noted) has the highest crime rate in the UK, with sexual offences and violence by far the most numerous. Within its boundaries, its menfolk have created a mini-Islamic State founded on the barbarities of seventh century Arabia, what Hussain described as 'the culture of caliphism'. (Only a Muslim can get away with a comment like that and not be accused of Islamophobia.)

Disabled children - and the prevalence of Muslim consanguine marriages, and their lack of vitamins due to their mothers wearing burkas during pregnancy, ensures they are well above the national average - also get the traditional treatment. Hussain says they are 'hidden away'...their parents 'don't care about these children', they 'take their social benefit money and use it to support their families, open shops back in Kashmir.' Hussain visited the Bradford Islam Centre, where he heard an imam command his flock to reject 'the innovations of the modern world'. So, married women are forbidden to leave home without their husband's permission, and when they do, their faces are invisible. What are on display everywhere are Palestinian flags., something that would bring cheer to anti-Zionist Shah. Young males aspire to becoming Jihadis, and indeed, some have. Sharia courts enforce the law of Allah with the approval of a Tory government, despite much of it being discriminatory against women, and for that reason, also contrary to English law and Magna Carta. Its article 29, one of three which still have the force of law, says 'the King will pass not pass justice on a subject *but by the lawful judgment of his Peers, or by the Law of the land*'. (Emphasis added) And to think that once upon a time, the Tories were the party of tradition, law and order.

The Bradford Muslims Hussain describes proliferate among the constituents Shah has relied on to further her political career. Should it be a surprise then that from time to time, she makes abusive comments about Israeli Jews, that she proposed deporting the entire Jewish population of Israel to the USA, that she described the editor of the *Sun* as a 'Nazi' for running a story on the Rotherham Muslim rape scandal, that she endorsed a spoof tweet urging everyone to ignore it,

and found herself sharing a pro-Hamas platform with Corbyn, McDonnell and Tariq Ali, denouncing a phantom Jewish apartheid in Israel while acquiescing in an all too real Muslim one in her own constituency?

While London was the main focus of pro-Hamas rallies, one in Swansea held on May 16 replicated, even if on a smaller scale, the same virulent anti-Semitism. After an address by Swansea West Labour MP Geraint Davis, in which he declared to a mainly Muslim audience, 'I stand in solidarity [with you] today', the chant went up in Arabic of '*Khaybar, Khaybar, ya Yahud, Jaish Muhammad, sa Yahud*', meaning, 'Jew, remember the battle of Kaybar, the army of Muhammad is returning,' a reference to the massacre of Jews at the town of Khaybar in north west Arabia, now Saudi Arabia, in AD 628. Also in May, at a pro-Hamas rally in Wolverhampton, one of the speakers, Labour councilor Obaida Ahmed, chanted through a megaphone the BDS war cry, 'From the River to the sea,' to which her audience replied 'Palestine will be Free', the river being the Jordan, and the sea, the Mediterranean.

With the London pro-Hamas rallies running out of steam, Corbyn's 'Stop the War Coalition' partners, the Socialist Workers Party, took up some of the slack in a demonstration staged on June 26, under the auspices of one of its many Stalinist-style popular front operations, the largely defunct 'People's Assembly Against Austerity', launched in the era of Conservative austerity under Prime Minister David Cameron. With Boris Johnson promising spending like there was no tomorrow, its original *raison d'être* had evaporated, which explains why in a photo of the rally, called, ostensibly, according to the *Socialist Worker*, to 'unite anger against the Tories', only one poster could be described as anti-Tory, while all the rest, at least thirty, attacked Israel instead. But then, some would say, why not, as the Tories are puppets of the Zionists anyway.

Anti-Semitism also spilled over in the last few days of the campaign in the Batley and Spen by-election of July 1, 2021. The seat fell vacant after Tracy Brabin, the successor to Labour's Jo Cox, murdered by a Brexit fanatic, was elected Mayor of West Yorkshire. One of 16 contestants for the seat was James Galloway, Brexiteer, veteran anti-Zionist, Saddam cheer-leader and with his old comrade Jeremy Corbyn, a guest presenter for Iran's Press TV channel. Galloway made it clear that his sole purpose in standing was to ensure the defeat of the Labour candidate, Kim Leadbetter, Jo Cox's sister, by doing what he had previously done in his previous election campaigns, successfully in Bradford West until ousted by the equally virulent anti-Zionist Naz Shah, and less so in east London; targeting the Muslim vote.

Already, the political temperature had been on the rise in the constituency after organised Muslim protests obtained the suspension of a Batley Grammar school teacher for showing to his class a cartoon of Mohammed. (For details, see Appendix XI) Then came the Gaza war which, as in other Muslim areas of the UK, had Palestinian flags flying in the constituency. All Galloway had to do was to bring things to the boil. In no time, the 'Muslim community' was buzzing with rumors that the Labour candidate was a lesbian (the devoutly Catholic Galloway was notorious for his homophobia) and that Starmer, despite his calibrated neutrality in the Gaza conflict, was in the pay of the Jews. When one of Galloway's team, Shammy Cheema, was found to have posted back in June 2019 that 'the Holohoax was a big fat cow that's been milked for the last 80 years', even Galloway had no choice but to drop him.

Labour had its own staff problem, only in this case, unfairly so. An unnamed top Labour election strategist had predicted that the party would lose Muslim votes to Galloway because of its post-Corbyn stance against anti-Semitism. Despite this being borne out by reports from canvassers, opinion polling and the final result, in which Galloway hoovered up the Muslim vote by winning 22% of the total cast, reducing Labour's previous majority of 3,525 to 323, the official was accused of 'racism' and 'vile Islamophobia' by the party's Muslim Network. Surely the Network would be better employed combatting Muslim anti-Semitism instead of slandering someone who had the honesty and courage to call it out. In what proved to be a futile last-minute bid to halt the drain on its Muslim vote, Labour allowed itself to be sucked into the cesspit of sub-continental communal politics and the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan, issuing a leaflet showing Boris Johnson shaking hands with the (Hindu supremacist) Prime Minister of India, Narendra Modi. This in its turn produced an entirely justified protest from Labour MP Virendra Sharma, Chair of the all-party Parliamentary group on India, calling it a 'cheap divide and rule politics not worthy of the Labour Party.' As its strategists must have been only too aware, post Corbyn, the party had become vulnerable to more Galloway-style challenges in seats similar to Batley and Spen. Nation-wide, 26 had a Muslim population of 20% or more, meaning that what had been an electoral advantage for Labour under the anti-Semite Corbyn (more than 85% of the Muslim vote in the 2019 general election went to Labour, compared to just over 64% under the Jewish Ed Miliband in 2015) was now, potentially at the very least, the opposite for the party under a leadership publicly committed to combatting anti-Semitism.

As the Hamas-Israel war raged in the Middle East, almost overnight, anti-Semitic incidents soared six-fold across the UK, with Muslims, including their children, on a Jew-baiting rampage, one stoked up by the series of pro-Hama rallies in London addressed by Corbyn and a supporting cast of fellow Israel-haters. Their Zionist-baiting was augmented by anti-Semitic diatribes in Urdu on YouTube, including one which went viral that called Hitler an 'angel' for 'the way he killed the Jews'. A girl's secondary school with which I had a personal connection had a large number of Muslim pupils. At the height of the Israel-Hamas conflict, parents received a letter from the school describing how Muslim pupil support for Hamas had 'spilled out [sic] into inappropriate behavior, including shouting, painting faces, bringing in banners and pasting stickers on walls', with 'some staff' being made to feel 'uncomfortable' - I suspect a euphemism for being verbally abused and possibly even physically threatened. Obviously, given its co-ordinated nature, none of this could have happened spontaneously. It had to have been pre-planned via social media, and almost certainly with the support of one or more local mosques and the pupils' parents. A few miles away in Woodford, north east London, another girl's secondary school was subjected to an identical operation, to which it responded with an almost identical letter to parents saying that 'school populations are not to be used as captive audiences for political messaging by anyone.' Why not, if they can be used by Hamas as human shields and media fodder? In Stoke-on-Trent, in a matter of hours, 1,100 signatures were gathered for a petition demanding the dismissal of a teacher who told a pupil to wipe off her hand a picture of the Palestinian flag. A Jewish school bus in Stamford Hill had its tyres slashed. A Jewish woman teacher at a North London school resigned after being assaulted by Muslim pupils who tried to stick 'Free Palestine' stickers in her hair. 'The whole

school was full of Palestine flags, the pupils all began shouting “free Palestine”. No disciplinary action was taken by the school’s senior staff. When the Head of a school in Leeds expressed his concern that Jewish students were feeling threatened by Muslim pupils displaying Palestinian flags, within hours, there was a Batley-style mobilization of (again, exclusively male) Muslim muscle at the school gates. Also as in Batley, in no time, the Head had issued a groveling apology.

Some of the incidents inevitably assumed an explicitly anti-Semitic character, with Jewish pupils being bombarded with demands to say which side they were on. The extent and level of aggressiveness of Muslim school protests was such that the Education Secretary wrote to school Heads to ‘remind schools of their legal duties regarding political impartiality’ and to make it clear that ‘anti-Semitism is racism’ and as such, ‘has no place in our schools.’ (Ken Livingstone of course would disagree. He has said that anti-Semitism is ‘not the same thing’ as racism. In the same spirit, the school demonstrations were welcomed by the traditionally anti-Zionist *New Statesman*.) An investigation into school anti-Semitism by the *Jewish Chronicle* in 2022 uncovered a video shot in the playground of the Islamic Republic of Iran School (yes, that is its official name) in St John’s Wood, north west London. The school’s Muslim children were singing a song about their joining 313 mythical warriors in a holy war against Jewish infidels. Other, similar, scenes were videoed at the nearby Islamic Centre of England, where Corbyn was videoed making a speech in February 2014, at an event celebrating the 35th anniversary of Iran’s ‘Islamic Revolution’, excerpts of which I cite in this work. (See Appendix G)

On June 5, 2021, that is, only a matter of days after the wave of pro-Hamas demonstrations swept through English schools, a public investigation began in London into China’s treatment of its one million Uyghur Muslims. The tribunal’s findings were given prominent coverage by UK press and TV and, one would assume, (though perhaps naively) by Middle Eastern and Pakistani TV channels that Muslim families in the UK usually prefer to watch. After all, Muslims had been ‘treated like dogs’, ‘chained’, ‘tortured’ and their women ‘sterilised’, an act of real genocide, unlike the fictitious one in Gaza. One would, again, perhaps naively, assume that such outrages would provoke protests by Muslim school children no less vociferous and widespread than those on behalf the Palestinians, just as, no less naively, one would have expected Black Lives Matter to protest against the black slave markets of Libya exposed by CNN. Why no flag burnings outside the Chinese and Myanmar embassies? Why no impassioned denunciations by Corbyn of the genocidists of Peking and Rangoon to the assembled Muslim masses? But surely by now, we should have learned not to entertain such expectations, however reasonable they may seem. Because, as anyone who has, as I have done, examined the political career of Corbyn, the professional selective protestor *par excellence*, knows, that is not how the outrage industry works. To prove my point, given the opportunity, I would pose four questions to a school’s Muslim pupils who had been programmed to demand ‘Freedom for Palestine’.

- 1) ‘In what sense is Gaza not free? Is Gaza under Israeli occupation?’
- 2) ‘Tibet is under Chinese occupation. Why then are you only demanding “freedom for Palestine”?’ The most coherent answer will almost certainly be, because they are Muslims like us.

- 3) 'Very well then. Do you know that millions of Muslims are being persecuted, enslaved, uprooted and killed in China and Myanmar? And that Muslim girls just like you are being killed in Afghanistan because, just like you, they go to school?' I doubt very much that any will. But let us assume that some do.
- 4) 'Why then are you not protesting for them? Why only for the Muslims of Palestine?' Silence.

If I was their school Head (Allah forbid), in keeping with the balance and objectivity required by law in such matters, I would set all senior school pupils the following exercise: Compare and contrast the founding texts of Hamas and Israel, namely, the Hamas Covenant of 1988, and the Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel of May 14, 1948.

One quarter of the more than 600 anti-Semitic incidents recorded in June 2021 occurred in schools and universities, the former replicating, in one form or another, those I have described - surely an intolerable state of affairs, and one that reflects badly on the cultural level of both those who took part in them and their parents. As for incidents involving adult Muslims, let us begin with a legal one that occurred at a traditional national event, the FA Cup Final. After Leicester City's win against Chelsea, two of their team displayed Palestinian flags as they did their victory lap. In accordance with its stated policy of allowing flags to be displayed in football stadiums, the FA took no disciplinary action, on the grounds that doing so was not political. That would have been the case if the flags had displayed the team's colours and logo. But Leicester is in England, not the West Bank or Gaza.

Typical of more conventional incidents were a Jewish nurse wearing a star of David pendant being accosted in her east London hospital's lift by two Muslim men, who accused her of murdering babies; a swastika daubed on the pulpit of a Finsbury Park synagogue, and a Chigwell, Essex rabbi being hospitalized by two men, who were later arrested and charged with religiously aggravated assault. A police spokesman said 'we do not believe this incident is related to events taking place overseas or incidents that have taken place elsewhere in the country.' That's right, plod. Two men with Muslim names wake up one morning in this of all weeks and then a matter of hours later, for no particular reason are beating up a rabbi. Even so, in an unprecedented measure, police were dispatched to protect synagogues and other Jewish properties around the country from presumably equally random attacks, just one more example of how Islam, with more than a little help from the pogrom mongering of the likes of Naz Shah, was poisoning the UK's body politic.

Meanwhile, in a surge of Jew-hatred not witnessed in Germany since the Nazi 'Crystal Night' pogrom of November 1938, Berlin and other cities were the scene of violent pro-Hamas demonstrations by leftists, Muslims and, who knows, Neo-Nazis, because on a similar occasion in the Hamas-Israel conflict of 2014 they had successfully availed themselves of a similar opportunity to swim in a broader anti-Jewish tide. Muslim demonstrators showed in their own multicultural way their gratitude for Chancellor Merkel's illegal invitation to be her guests, as they did on Cologne's 2015 New Year Eve 'night of the rapes'. They waved Hamas flags and burned Israeli ones, (a factory in Iran makes and markets them for this purpose) chanting the BDS war cry for a Palestine 'from the River [Jordan] to the

[Mediterranean] Sea, and attacked synagogues and Jews. As always on such occasions, 'solidarity with Palestine' rapidly revealed itself as a murderous anti-Semitism bred into Muslims almost from the cradle. Because nowhere in Europe has there been any such 'solidarity' on display, either by the left or Muslims, for the more than four thousand Palestinians murdered by the regime of President Assad of Syria, who in 2009, played host to (and was photographed) with a UK parliamentary delegation headed by human rights campaigner Jeremy Corbyn,

For decades now, Arabs have been killing Arabs, and Muslims, Muslims, on a scale that dwarfs the number of Palestinians who have died, needlessly, in their leaders' futile, unending war against Israel, yet not a peep have we heard from the Sharia protest industry. Even though President Assad denies the very existence of a Palestinian people, because of his intransigent opposition to Israel, his atrocities have been given a free pass from not only Muslims, but the entire spectrum of western anti-Zionists who have been honoured with his hospitality, from Corbyn on the far left through Liberal Democrat Baroness Tonge in the centre, Tory Lord Sheikh on the centre right to on the extreme right, the white supremacist and former KKK Grand Wizard David Duke, and former *Fuehrer* of the neo-Nazi British National Party, Nick Griffin. As with US blacks, some Palestinian lives have mattered more than others.

The UK was not the only European country where Jews were being being targeted by the religion of peace. With German police at full stretch having to protect synagogues from attacking mobs, a spokesman for Chancellor Merkel, Steffen Seibert, admitted that 'Jews cannot move freely in Germany.' Yet this was 2021, not 1935, the year when under the Nazi Nuremberg race laws, the movements of Jews were legally restricted, and their status relegated to that of second-class citizens. 'What has been heard in the last few days of hatred of Jews and anti-Semitic abuse is shameful' continued Seibert. 'There are anti-Semites in various camps in Germany. Right-wing extremists and Neo-Nazis have always been part of it. And in these days, it becomes clear to us. There are also Muslim anti-Semites.' Eureka! At last it was, so to speak, official. Muslims can be anti-Semitic, just like Nazis. Hardly surprising, seeing that so many admire Hitler. And who, illegally, invited them in? The same government that was now having to give Jews protection from their violence and abuse. Seibert also made it clear that his government, a coalition of Christian and Social Democrats, condemned the Hamas rocket attacks on Israel, and that 'Israel has the right to defend itself against these attacks', a fact lost on demonstrators not only in Germany but across the world, who found no fault with anti-Semitic, genocidal terrorists killing Israeli civilians, but condemned Israel for trying to prevent it. By contrast, in a commendable act of solidarity not only with the Jews of Israel but of Europe, Israeli flags were flown from all German, Austrian and Czech government buildings. Perhaps at last, there was a recognition in some political quarters at least that in its indulgence of bogus Muslim asylum seekers, Europe had clasped a particularly venomous viper to its bosom. And again, as so often in the past, it was the Jews who were the ones being bitten.

Just as he did on a similar occasion in 2014, when Hamas rockets also rained down on Israeli urban areas, at the Downing Street rally, Corbyn, the Jew-haters' Pied Piper, again only founds words of condemnation for their target, claiming that 'innocent lives are being lost, all because of the occupation of Palestine', which ignored the indisputable facts that firstly, Gaza was not 'occupied' by Israel, and had not been since 2005, and secondly, as in previous conflicts, if Hamas had not

launched its rocket attack on Israel, no ‘innocent lives’ would have been lost, Palestinian no less than Jewish. As Corbyn had declined to condemn the initial Hamas rocket attack, which killed at least six Israeli civilians, this meant that the only ‘innocent lives’ whose loss he deplored were of those killed in Israeli bombing raids on military targets in Gaza. Yet many, if not most, were the intended consequence of the Hamas tactic of deploying sacrificial ‘human shields’ at or close to rocket launching sites, a practice that is contrary to international law. Under the Geneva Convention Protocol II of 1977 and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, approved in 1998 and effective as of July 1, 2002, the use of civilian human shields is unequivocally declared to be a war crime. Yet six months after this law coming into effect, Corbyn headed a list of signatories to the Cairo Declaration of December 18-19, 2002 which, while twice falsely accusing Israel of committing ‘genocidal crimes against the Palestinians people’, *explicitly endorsed* the use of human shields in the event of a US-led invasion of Iraq. The relevant article, number seven, of part four of the Declaration, a so-called ‘Action Plan’, reads: ‘Prepare to send human shields to Iraq.’ I repeat, ‘peace campaigner’ Corbyn signed this Declaration, thus giving his approval to the committing of a war crime and thereby, by so doing, under the terms of the Rome Statute, rendering himself liable to prosecution by the International Criminal Court. (See Footnote) What is also a war crime is the deliberate targeting of non-combatants, which Hamas does by aiming its rockets indiscriminately at Israeli urban areas. The Geneva Convention Protocol I, Articles 51 and 2, says: ‘The civilian population as such, as well as individual civilians, shall not be an object of attack.’ The Hamas tactic of suicide bombers blowing themselves up in civilian locations such as Israeli restaurants, markets and buses, is likewise outlawed by the same Protocol: ‘Acts of threats of violence, the primary purpose of which are to spread terror among the civilian population are prohibited.’ By the Geneva Convention, yes. But not by Allah, especially when their target is, as the *Koran* puts it so well, the offspring of ‘apes and swine’.

As in previous conflicts, and that of the Gaza war of 2023-4, Hamas claims of civilian deaths in Gaza were almost without exception accepted and re-cycled by the media as genuine. This applied to Tory papers like the *Sun* and the *Daily Mail* no less than to those with an anti-Zionist disposition. On May 17, the on-line *Sun* carried two photos of bomb damage in Gaza with the captions: ‘Israel’s bombing in Gaza killed at least 42 Palestinians on Sunday’, and ‘In Gaza, 58 children and 34 women have been killed since the violence began last week.’ The on-line *Daily Mail* did the same: ‘Israel’s bombardment of the Gaza Strip’ had ‘killed 212 Palestinians and [sic?] 62 children’. How could the *Mail* and the *Sun* be so sure? Had their reporters personally counted all the bodies? If, as is certain, they had not, why were these numbers not prefaced by the standard ‘according to claims by Hamas officials?’ One statistic that the two papers did not provide was the number of Hamas military personnel killed by Israeli bombing. According to the UN Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs, a body that in no sense can be suspected of sympathizing with the Israeli cause, of the 245 estimated deaths attributed to Israeli military action, just over half, 128, were civilians. The remainder were Hamas fighters. And this qualified as *genocide*?

All the media reporting on the conflict knew full well that as in its previous and subsequent military clashes with Israel Hamas had deliberately chosen to launch its rockets from non-military buildings and infrastructures in densely populated

areas so as to maximise civilian casualties, a tactic even condemned by the anti-Israel Amnesty International after the Hamas-Israel conflict of 2014. It is also in violation of principles adopted in 1999 by the International Red Cross and Red Crescent (therefore also binding on Islamic armed forces). The aim of these rulings was to bring about 'full compliance by all the parties to an armed conflict with their obligations under international humanitarian law to better protect and assist the civilian population and other victims.' Israel's 'Iron Dome', and shelters for its civilians, did just that. Why then did no-one among all those, Muslim and infidel alike, who claimed to support the Palestinian cause, ask the so obvious question: How was it that Hamas, awash with funding from its Arab and Muslim allies and western aid agencies, and led by two (exile) billionaires, could not afford to provide the resources to build shelters for its civilian population when they could afford to dig 600 miles of tunnels for military purposes? To ask is to answer. Hamas not only wanted as many civilians as possible to be killed, it even said so, and had explained how it went about it. (See below) It knew this was a war crime, but also knew that with its guaranteed majority support in the UN, they would never be found guilty of it. That verdict was reserved only for Israel.

In the Hamas-Israel conflict of 2014, there were western reporters, including some working for media sympathetic to the Palestinian cause, who were eye witnesses to another Hamas tactic, that of fighters using civilian locations and disguises. The *Washington Post* reported on July 17 how 'during a lull [in the fighting] a group of men at a Mosque in northern Gaza said they had returned to clean up the broken green glass from windows shattered in the previous day's bombardment. [as soldiers do in a war] But they could be seen moving small rockets into the mosque.' A Canadian TV reporter saw 'several Hamas gunmen', one 'dressed in a woman's headscarf with the tip of a gun poking out from under the cloak.' The *Globe and Mail* of July 26 reported that two Hamas fighters 'disguised as women' (Allah allows transvestism, like much else that is otherwise forbidden, such as sodomy - see Preface - if it serves the cause) were seen 'concealing weapons under their cloaks', and another 'had his weapon wrapped in a baby blanket and held on his chest as if it were a child.'

Regarding Hamas accusations that the Israeli military deliberately targeted 'women and children', those in the west who recycled this lie evidently never asked themselves the obvious question; what military or political purposes could this have served? Militarily, not only none. It would also have been a waste of time and resources. And, with the bulk of the world's media and official public opinion largely already against them, the last thing the Israelis would want to do was to risk losing what few friends they had by committing war crimes that served no military purpose.

The Hamas manual titled 'Urban Warfare', a secret document acquired by the Israelis in the 2014 conflict, readily concedes, contrary to its public allegations that the Israeli military deliberately targets civilians, that it does its best to avoid them, hence the Hamas tactic of using civilians as a cover (i.e., 'shield') for their own offensive operations. It stands to reason that this illegal, obscene tactic would only work if Israel tried to avoid killing civilians. I quote: 'The soldiers and commanders [of the IDF] must (n.b.) limit the use of their weapons and tactics that lead to the harm and unnecessary loss of people and destruction of civilian facilities.' So much for Jewish 'baby killers'. Hamas, on the other hand, conducts its wars against Israel in ways that are explicitly intended, for propaganda purposes, to maximise the

deaths of its own civilians, especially children. The manual says the Hamas tactic of using civilian areas as a base for operations (i.e., for rocket launching) is intended to bring about 'the destruction of civilian homes. This will increase the hatred of the citizens towards the attackers [not to speak of global 'public opinion'] and increase their gathering around the city's defenders', thus leading, in turn, to yet more civilian casualties. This is how Hamas wages its holy war against Israel. But no one on the left would acknowledge, let alone condemn it, any more than did the supporters of Hamas on the UN Human Rights Council, one of which, the delegate from North Korea, instead accused Israel of a 'disproportionate' use of force, something that never happens in the happy, free prosperous land of North Korea. This too you could not make up.

Another point that is rarely if ever made by those who should be making it is that any civilized government, confronted with the prospect of an aerial bombardment would, as the UK's did in the blitz, as a matter of priority, evacuate children to areas of safety. (I was one of them) Instead, Hamas chose, as the above cited document explicitly says, to locate children in situations of maximum danger, and then use their wounded and dead bodies as photo fodder for the corpse-hungry world media. The fanatically anti-Zionist *Washington Post*, obviously with the assistance of Hamas, obliged by putting their pictures on its front page. Alternatively, Hamas could have located its rocket-launching sites well beyond the limits of urban areas before initiating their attack against Israel. But again, for the same reasons stated, it chose not to do so. There was, uniquely, a third option for Hamas to protect its most vulnerable civilians, which was to accommodate them in its 600-mile network of tunnels, the so-called metro. However, they were reserved exclusively for the fearless warriors of Allah, leaving children up above to die as media fodder. Finally, none of these measures would have been necessary had Hamas not decided to launch its rocket attack on Israel in the first place.

The Hamas MP Fathi Hamad can be seen explaining on a YouTube video why none of these measures was taken: 'For the Palestinian people, death has become an industry [sic!] at which women excel, and so do all the people living on this land. This is why they have formed human shields of the women, the *children*, the elderly and the muhadijeen.' (Emphasis added) Jihadis are not only prepared to sacrifice Muslim children for the cause of Allah. They are also just as willing, possibly more so, given they were Jews, to kill the children of his infidel enemies. Sheikh Muhammad Sayyed Tantawi of Cairo University has ruled that 'every martyrdom operation against any Israeli, including *children*, women and *teenagers* is a legitimate act according to religious law and an Islamic commandment.' (Emphasis added) Endorsement for Jihadi 'baby killing' has been forthcoming from the most unlikely of quarters. During the Hamas-Israel conflict of 2014, Lebanese porn star Mia Khalifa tweeted: 'I hope Hamas targets schools and kills some of their children. Save the world from future Zionist scum.' Hamas has repeatedly acted accordingly, during the 'Second Intifada' between September 2000 and August 2005 murdering 33 Jewish Israeli children under the age of 16 in a series of 'operations' against civilian targets.

Crazy as it may sound to the rational and especially the secular, more even than for their propaganda value, Hamas seeks, facilitates and even celebrates (especially its mothers) the sacrifice of the lives of its own people for *theological* reasons because, as its Covenant makes clear throughout, Hamas is an exclusively religious movement, waging a holy war for Islam's conquest not just of Israel but the entire

world. And unlike many western clerics, Hamas really believes what it says and, what is more, is ready, even eager not only to kill, but die for it. For Jihadis, death in battle against infidels - especially Jewish ones - is the sole purpose in life, a passport to paradise and the embrace of its 72 virgins. This is something the western mind, even after experiencing at first hand its lethal consequences for two decades and more, still has great difficulty in comprehending...and yet there it is, in the *Koran*. (See Appendix L)

But there is something surely even Corbyn understands, as does everybody else who condemns Israeli measures to counter attacks on its territory as 'disproportionate', without ever specifying what if any, the correct 'proportion' should be. There is not a state on our planet that if subjected to such acts of aggression, would not take similar retaliatory measures, and that in doing so, few if any would, like Israel, warn civilians of them in advance. (How this furthers its goal of genocide remains a mystery.) As a 'peace campaigner', Corbyn of all people should have known that indiscriminately firing rockets into another state's territory is contrary to international law, and to resolutions adopted unanimously (including with the votes of those who supply Hamas with its rockets) in 1974 by the United Nations, resolutions which also uphold the right of the state under such an attack to defend itself. And yet Corbyn had never condemned the firing of rockets into Israel, only Israel's response. The firing of rockets by Hamas into Israeli territory on May 10, 2021 and its invasion of Israel on October 7, 2023 were no less acts of unprovoked aggression than were Germany's invasion of Belgium on August 3, 1914, Poland on September 1, 1939 and the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the Soviet Union's of Poland on September 17, 1939, Finland on November 30, 1939, Hungary on November 4 1956, Czechoslovakia on August 20, 1968, and Afghanistan on 25 December, 1979, Iraq's of Kuwait on August 2, 1990, Egypt and Syria's of Israel on October 6, 1973, Argentina's of the Falklands on April 2, 1982 and Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq's of Israel on May 15, 1948. While the Hamas rocket attacks on Israel were not those of a sovereign state, they still constitute acts of aggression under the UN resolution of 1974. Wikipedia lists 36 separate rocket attacks against Israel from 2006 to May 2021, in which at least 20,000 rockets were fired, the overwhelming majority by Hamas.

All the acts of aggression listed above, if committed today, would be judged as contrary to international law (some in fact have been). But not by everyone, because when the target of the aggression is a state that happens to be Jewish, everything for Corbyn and his anti-Zionist comrades changes. International law ceases to operate, to be usurped by that of Allah, under which the Jews become the aggressors, and the aggressors, the victims. And to compound the hypocrisy, when Muslims unleash indiscriminate terror on civilians in the west, they can be sure that as Corbyn did after the Manchester bombing of May 22, 2017, Corbyn and Livingstone after the London bombings of July 7, 2005 (Corbyn said the UK's support for Israel was a 'major factor', while Livingstone blamed Labour Prime Minister Blair's invasion of Iraq, as did the Socialist Workers Party after 9/11,) the guilt of indiscriminately murdering civilians, including 'women and children', will be mitigated by locating it in the 'context' of the policies and crimes of western governments. But when Israel lawfully defends itself against Islamic terrorism, 'context' counts for nothing. It is as if Israel has for no reason other than sheer blood lust one day chosen to go on a killing spree of Muslim civilians.

On the same day that Corbyn was denouncing the taking by Israel of ‘innocent lives’, he had an opportunity, one might say even the duty, to do so again, given his self-appointed dual mission as a peace and human rights campaigner, and his much-advertised special concern for Muslims. And all the more so because this time, the lives, those of Afghan school girls, unlike those of Gaza’s Palestinian civilians, had been targeted deliberately, by a car bomb. The result was 85 dead and 147 wounded. Although the Taliban, which had in the past attacked schools that taught girls, on this occasion denied responsibility for the massacre, what we can be absolutely sure of is that whoever perpetrated this appalling atrocity, they were not Jews, but devotees of the Religion of Peace. And so, no protest from Corbyn or, as we have come to expect, from any Muslims either.

Some Muslim lives are not only less equal than others, but seem not to matter at all. Around the globe millions - Muslims, leftists, Nazis - have taken to the streets to spew their venom against the Jews of Israel and in many cases, not just of Israel, with five demonstrations in four weeks, just in London, in solidarity with Hamas in its war against Israel of May 2021. But not a single one, ever, for the Muslim victims of the Taliban’s theocratic, misogynistic tyranny, for the million Uyghur Muslims of China, subjected to internment, forced labour and possibly genocide, and for the Rohingya Muslims of Myanmar, a million or more driven out of their homeland, raped and massacred by a ruthless military despotism, just as there were none for the Muslims of Chechnya, butchered in their tens of thousands by Yeltsin and Putin, and for those of Kurdistan, denied a homeland by the quadruple terror of Saddam, Erdogan, Assad, and Corbyn’s clerical comrades, the Ayatollahs of Iran; none for the Muslim victims of Serbian genocide in Bosnia and Kosovo (denied by Corbyn), or for the 100,000 or more Muslims slaughtered in the ten-year Algerian civil war of the 1990s; for the Palestinians...Arafat claimed 25,000...massacred by the army of King Hussein of Jordan in the ‘Black September’ of 1970; the 4,000 Palestinians murdered by Corbyn’s host, President Assad of Syria, more than six hundred tortured to death, 37 of them women, and the million or so Muslim dead in the eight-year Islamic civil war between Iraq and Iran in the 1980s. Last but by no means least, there were no protests on behalf of the tens of thousands who died at the hands of the Islamic State, some, as prescribed by the *Koran*, being crucified (Chapter 5, Verse 34) or decapitated (Chapter 47, Verse 4), others buried or burned alive, many simply for believing in a different version of Islam. All told, we are looking at several million Muslims, ‘women and children’ no less than men, killed, wounded, mutilated, raped, tortured, enslaved or driven out of their homelands either by their fellow Muslims or by infidels other than Jews. But all without a single protest from either the (selective) internationalists of the left, or the legions of Allah the merciful and the compassionate.

In May 2021, as protestors across the world raged against ‘Zionist baby-killers’, news reached the west of the killing, some by beheading, of 22 villagers. Among the dead were children. But as their killers were not Jews but Islamic State Muslims, and the children not Palestinians in Gaza, but black Africans in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, their murder caused not the least ripple of concern or peep of protest from the Leftist and Muslim diaspora outrage industries. Their compassion was evidently of a kind that can be turned on or off like a tap, like that of Black Lives Matter, depending not only on whose lives are taken, but who takes them. (See Appendix XI)

Following 9/11, the US-led invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq inevitably, though not deliberately, resulted in civilian casualties. In Iraq, in March and April 2003, they totalled around 7,500. From that time onwards, the overwhelming majority and far larger number of civilian deaths in Iraq were the result of Muslims killing Muslims, almost invariably as a continuation of the centuries-old hostility between Sunnis and Shi'as. Estimates of the numbers killed vary considerably, the lowest figure being that of the Iraq Health Ministry, which puts the number of civilians killed by (Muslim) anti-government actions between January 1, 2005 and January 1, 2009 at 87,215. Subsequently, and then with the emergence of ISIS, the killing greatly accelerated. But unlike the far fewer deaths attributed to western military operations in 2003, this slaughter of Muslims by Muslims aroused no protests whatsoever from world Muslim opinion, or its infidel shadow, the *dhimmi* left. 'Stop the War' demonstrations wound up just as the Muslim civil war exploded.

After 9/11 and the invasion of 2001, the same sequence of events unfolded in Afghanistan, accompanied by the same Sharia left and Islamic disinterest, once the Taliban began to take its toll of Muslims loyal to the post-invasion government in Kabul. In some cases, 'disinterest' is hardly the word. In the wake of 9/11, there were deep divisions on the far left as to the stance to be adopted towards Jihadist movements in general and the Taliban in particular. The UK Socialist Workers Party, then by far the largest of the far-left groups, was already so committed to its pursuit of an alliance with Jihadist Islam that it felt itself unable to condemn the terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre. Rounding on those on the left who had done so, the SWP, in a document submitted to its 2001 conference, complained that 'the rest of the Left have an undialectical [sic] understanding of religion in practice...they seem more fixated with "Islamic fundamentalism" than with US imperialism...Islam can be a motivating force for the masses to fight back against imperialism and poverty'. Islam 'in practice' had indeed proved it could fly passenger jets, dialectically, into skyscrapers...so who needed Marxism?

'The rest of the left' is a little unfair. At least one other far leftist group, based in South America, and therefore no doubt fuelled by the same, or even greater anti-US animus than the SWP, proclaimed after 9/11 that 'the "barbarian" Taliban represents progress precisely because they challenge the imperialist barbarism'. As we shall see, the identical argument was invoked fourteen years later by the Sharia left 'Stop the War Coalition' to oppose military action against the Islamic State. A variant on the same theme of the anti-imperialist, in this case anti-Zionist '*sauvage noble*' was expounded by the SWP's John Molyneux, who argued that 'an illiterate, conservative, superstitious Muslim Palestinian peasant who supports Hamas is more progressive than an educated liberal atheist Israeli who supports Zionism (even critically)'. Molyneux took care not to include anti-Semitism as one of his Palestinians peasant's ennobling qualities. But even if he been honest and done so it would have made no difference. Not only in the estimation of the SWP, but nearly the entire far left, Jew-killing Hamas, like the Taliban, stands for progress, and democratic, secular, Israel, and with it, the entire West, for the darkest reaction.

Since Hamas and the Taliban were pre-eminently theocratic movements, it necessarily followed that the religion which guided their policies and actions, however barbaric, had to be afforded a similar endorsement by Molyneux: 'There are some religions that are overwhelmingly held by the poor and the excluded and there are some religions that back up the establishment, the rich and the powerful. So when the rich and the powerful attack the religion of the poor and excluded, then

everyone should know which side they are on.' Where to begin? Well, firstly, far from the presumably western 'establishment' 'attacking' Islam, the contrary is the case. It leans over backwards to accommodate it. With its zealous promotion of multi-culturalism and 'diversity', acceptance of the legitimacy of Sharia courts, provision of Muslim-only state funded schools, turning a blind eye to forced and child marriage, FGM and gang rape, the UK's political and legal 'establishment' had gone to extraordinary lengths to accommodate and even appease what it calls the religion of peace, while enacting laws under the rubric of combatting 'Islamophobia' that criminalise those who are neither rich nor of the establishment for daring to resist Islam's pernicious impact on their freedoms and culture. As for 'religions that back up the establishment' what other role than this does Islam perform in the 56 countries where is the state, and in the case of Saudi Arabia, the only permitted faith? It is hard to believe not only that educated people can entertain such convoluted nonsense, but even harder to credit, that as socialists, they genuinely believe that movements such as ISIS, Hamas and the Taliban represent the best hope for the progress of mankind.

The opportunity to evaluate the kind of 'progress' the Taliban officered mankind as compared with the 'barbarism' of western civilisation arose in the wake of its brief occupation in September 2015 of the north Afghanistan city of Kunduz. Amnesty International described in graphic detail the 'progress' women in particular enjoyed during the few days of Taliban rule, recording 'multiple credible reports' of killings, rapes and other horrors meted out against the city's inhabitants. Taliban fighters were 'using a "hit list" to track down their targets'. Young boys were being 'used to help the Taliban conduct house-to-house searches to locate and abduct their targets, including women'. Taliban fighters 'raped female relatives' [of those wanted] and killed family members, including children, of police commanders and soldiers.' It gets worse, or better, depending on how one evaluates, of course from a safe distance, Taliban 'progress': 'The relative of a woman who worked as a midwife in Kunduz maternity hospital told how Taliban fighters' gang-raped and then killed her and another mid-wife because they accused them of providing reproductive health services to women in the city.' Is this what the *dhimmi* feminists of the Socialist Workers Party understood by a 'motivating force' that 'represents progress'?

If there is one issue more than any other that is certain to arouse the fury, simulated or otherwise, of the far left, it is the killing of Palestinians. But not any Palestinians. While it only requires one solitary Palestinian to die in an incident reportedly involving the Israeli security forces for the outrage industry to go into overdrive, the death of thousands at the hands of fellow Muslim Arabs arouses not the least interest. There are no cries of war crimes or genocide either by the United Nations Human Rights Council, the PA, Hamas, Hezbollah, ISIS, any Arab or Islamic state, UK Muslim pressure groups or clerics, or the Sharia left. And yet the facts are known, and accessible to any interested party. In the first days of 2015, the Working Group for Palestinians in Syria issued a press release which reported that since the beginning of the civil war(s) in Syria, 2,596 Palestinians had been killed by the various factions involved in the conflict. 80,000 more had been driven into exile, mainly to Jordan and Lebanon. Others were tortured to death. But not a word of condemnation from either the UN or the protest industry. Some Palestinians are less equal than others, in this case, even when dead.

The internecine nature of Arab politics, and its widely varying estimation of the worth of Palestinian lives, was dramatically illustrated by what became known as the 'Black September' of 1970, and its sequel. Because of Jordan's large Palestinian population (around 50%), relations between its king and the PLO were at best frosty, often verging on violent. Contrary to Article 27 of the PLO's Covenant, the first PLO Chairman, Ahmad Shukairy chose to meddle in Jordan's internal affairs, declaring on one occasion that that 'our Jordanian brothers are actually Palestinians', a claim that was only half true, because half were Bedouins. King Hussein took up the challenge, replying that 'any hand raised against this united and struggle nation will be cut off and any eye that looks at us with hatred will be gouged out.' This is how the partisans of Arab unity expressed their brotherly love. A similar fraternal solidarity was displayed between Sunnis and Shia's on the blood drenched sands of Yemen, Syria and Iraq.

When the demagogue Shukairy fell from favour after Israel's victory in the June War of 1967, he was replaced first by a compromise candidate, Yahya Hamuda, and then, in February 1969, by Nasser's nominee, Yasser Arafat. Relations between Nasser, the radical Pan-Arabist President of Egypt and the conservative Jordanian monarchy, whose security forces were almost exclusively composed of fiercely anti-Palestinian Bedouins, were anything but fraternal. Mistakenly assuming that as his nominee, Nasser therefore would back him, Arafat made a bid for power in Jordan, which provided just the pretext King Hussein needed to drive the PLO out of his kingdom. A brutal crackdown on PLO militias in September 1970 resulted in 11 days of fighting in and around the capital Amman, followed by a cease fire and, over time, the departure of the PLO to pastures new in Lebanon, and then Tunisia. Cairo radio accused Jordan of 'genocide' of the Palestinians, while Arafat claimed 10,000 had been killed. Again, Muslims were killing Muslims, Arabs, Arabs.

But far worse was to follow. Decamping to Lebanon, it was not long before Arafat was tempted to launch another bid for power by the PLO. Again, meeting stiff resistance, this time from Lebanon's large non-Muslim minority, one third of the total population, the resulting bloody stalemate rapidly reduced the once stable and, by Arab standards, prosperous country, to a state of chaos, triggered by a frenzy of kidnappings, and tribalist and clan killings involving a myriad of hitherto delicately counterbalanced religious and ethnic factions. A foretaste of the kind of regime the PLO intended to establish in a de-Zionised and 'liberated Palestine' was provided by its treatment of political opponents, and especially of the media. Stemming from its two decades of French rule, alone in the Arab world, Lebanon had a tradition of a free press, one that the PLO set about eradicating by terror. No journalist, however sympathetic they might have been to the PLO, was safe from kidnapping, torture or assassination. Salim al-Lawzi, owner and editor of the too-independent weekly *al-Hawadith* had dared to warn his readers of the threat to Lebanese unity posed by the arrival of the PLO. His punishment was to be seized, taken to a PLO mountain redoubt in the village of Armun, and tortured to death. His body was found with his fingers cut off, joint by joint, his eyes gouged out, and all his limbs amputated. The religion of pieces. Another method favoured by the PLO for eliminating an opponent was to attach all four limbs to four cars, and then have them driven simultaneously in four directions. In the midst of this orgy of killing, PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat was invited to address the United Nations.

Very quickly, the Lebanese press learned to speak with one voice when it came to reporting the heroic deeds of Arafat's storm troopers. Neither were western

reporters exempted from intimidation. Four were abducted: two from the *New York Times* and one each from *Newsweek* and the *Washington Post*. Fearing for their journalists' lives, all three publications agreed not to report the kidnappings. Even so, three reporters were murdered: one from the UK *Observer*; another, BBC TV journalist Sean Toolan, who was shot dead in a Beirut Street as punishment for making a programme about PLO terrorism, and the West German Robert Pfeffer, who had been investigating PLO links with German urban terrorists. Again, PLO hostage taking and murder ensured that just like the Lebanese press, western news agencies and publications very quickly learned that the safest policy was to report events in Lebanon in a way that did not lead to more kidnappings and assassinations. Between 1982 and 1991, a total of 102 mainly western hostages were kidnapped by a number of Lebanese factions, the majority of them by Corbyn's 'friends' and Westminster guests, Hezbollah. Most were either killed or died in captivity. One, Kenneth Timmerman, was held for twenty-four days in a PLO prison. When released, no western news agency would report his account of his experiences. He relates that he was 'coldly received' and told they would report nothing. 'They still had people in West Beirut [the PLO zone] and would not put them in jeopardy.' His own reflections on his encounter with PLO rule, and the motives for its concealment from the public, are well worth reproducing here, because of their relevance to the manner in which the world's media reported, or rather misreported, the Hamas-Israel wars of 2014, 2021 and 2023-4:

Terror, intimidation, and the law of silence [an apt allusion to the Mafia's *omerta*]; these are the basic tools used by the Palestinian Liberation Organisation to manipulate the international press. Most of the sins committed by western newsmen under PLO constraint were sins of omission: showing bombed buildings but not the arms stockpiled in their basements; describing bombed hospitals but not the PLO fighters whose bases of operations were inside; and so forth. The list is infinite, but the effect unmistakable; the reversal of international opinion on the moral equation of the Middle East conflict. [Every word of this can be applied to the conduct of the media in the Hamas-Israel war of 2014 as, off the record, some reporters shamefacedly admitted. After Lebanon, everyone knew the rules, and the consequences of their violation.]

Once more, the corpses piled up, many disfigured, mutilated and even raped by Arafat's militiamen. Syria's Ba'athist rulers, who had always regarded Lebanon, along with Jordan, Israel and Palestine, as part of their envisaged 'Greater Syria', decided to use the PLO-generated mayhem as a pretext for an invasion, which they duly set in motion in June 1976. Once again, Arabs were killing Arabs, Muslims, Muslims, as the armoured columns of the Syrian army easily overwhelmed the less well-equipped units of the PLO. Then President Assad of Syria changed tack. Pursuing a strategy of divide and rule, the better to absorb into his 'Greater Syria' a Lebanon exhausted and paralysed by its multiple civil wars, Assad turned on the Maronite Christian militias, who had been emboldened by his taming of the PLO. Eventually, both Lebanon and its capital were carved up into a patchwork of largely self-governing mini-states, each with its own *capo*, army and infrastructure. Under pressure from Arab leaders, truces were regularly arranged between the fragments, and then almost immediately broken, as each faction attempted to extend its territory at the expense of its neighbours.

Stymied in its bid for total power in Beirut, the PLO deployed a portion of its forces in the south, from where it launched raids across the border against Israeli civilians. This was a fatal mistake. In 1982, Israel cried enough, and to the relief not only its own citizens, but the vast majority of Lebanese, launched an offensive across the border that reached as far north as Beirut. In a matter of days, the PLO military machine that for more than ten years had visited havoc, mayhem, misery and murder on the previously peaceful and prosperous people of Lebanon, was shattered. No-one outside their own ranks answered the call to come to their aid. Neither did a single Arab state, not even Syria, whose army of occupation stood by as Israel dealt with their Muslim and Arab brothers. With the PLO out of the way, Syria could set about creating its own proxy terrorist movement to enforce its control over a nation that yearned for a return to some kind of stability. The result was the birth and rise of Hezbollah, the Party of God, a movement beholden not to the Muslims of Lebanon, but its Shi'a paymasters, quartermasters and sponsors in Damascus and Tehran. The multiple civil wars triggered by the PLO's invasion of Lebanon claimed 150,000, mostly Arab Muslim lives and effectively reduced Lebanon to destitution, and its capital to rubble, one which before the arrival of the PLO, was regarded the most beautiful city in the Levant. Since the entire tragic episode was the outgrowth of Arab factional politics and could not therefore be plausibly attributed to the machinations of the Zionists, there were no diaspora Muslim or western leftist protests. It had been, to use a Muslim euphemism for such fratricidal bloodlettings, a family quarrel, just one more 'brothers' war'...certainly not a reason for street demonstrations. And the left agreed.

The reward for the PLO's second violation of its own Covenant, by another failed attempt to overthrow an Arab regime, was a second eviction, this time to exile in Tunisia. As for the Fatah organisation which took its name from the month of the PLO defeat in Jordan, instead of seeking revenge against the Arab regimes and leaders who had twice betrayed the Palestinians, Black September preferred instead the softer option of attacks on western airlines and, as its first major undertaking, the kidnapping and then killing of eleven Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics of 1972. The 'moderate' Palestinian Authority to this day continues to celebrate this atrocity and glorify those who organised and carried it out. When the chief of PA Intelligence, Amin Al Hindi, died in August 2010, *Al Hayat Al Jadida* of August 20, 2010 praised him as 'one of those stars who sparkled [sic] at one of the stormiest points at the international level - the operation that was carried out at the sports stadium in Munich, Germany, in 1972.' It was a veneration evidently shared by Jihadi useful idiot Jeremy Corbyn, who a year before being elected Leader of the Labour Party, travelled to Tunisia in October 2014 to attend a wreath-laying ceremony in honour of two Fatah leaders who masterminded the 'operation' and were later hunted down and killed by Mossad. In photos of the ceremony, Corbyn can be seen holding a giant wreath and joining in Islamic prayers for the murderers. There is no record of Corbyn laying any wreaths on the graves of their victims, or of any of the more than 1,100 Jewish Israeli civilians killed by his terrorist 'friends' Hamas and their co-Jihadists over the previous 20 years. On April 20, 2015, the same PA journal reported a session of the Fatah Central Committee, presided over by Mahmoud Abbas, in which it honoured the 42nd anniversary of the 'martyrdom death' of three of the Munich assassins, and 'emphasised its loyalty to their path, and that it would continue in their path of struggle'. When the Palestinian Authority today seeks, with some success, admission into world

sporting organisations, do those that administer them realise that the PA still honours the murderers of eleven Jewish Olympic athletes, and still regards Israeli sports teams as legitimate targets for kidnapping and murder? (See Appendix V for details)

The Middle East was not the only arena of Muslim fratricide. In Algeria, a concerted attempt by the Jihadist Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) to overthrow the quasi-secular FLN (National Liberation Front) unleashed a savage civil war that in this case claimed possibly as many as 200,000 lives. Another 'brothers' war' so, again, no leftist or diaspora Muslim protests ensued. On the basis of these examples - and there are others - it is reasonable to conclude that the killing of Muslims is only a matter for protest when non-Muslims are doing it (and as we have seen, as in the cases of China, Russia and Myanmar not always then) and that when these conditions are met and protests are staged, what we are therefore witnessing is selective, simulated outrage motivated not by compassion for the victims, but opportunism of the most cynical kind. Most of the above examples are of conflicts in which Muslims were killed by vastly larger and better equipped forces, and in which the Muslim casualties, by far the greater part civilian, were many times greater than of those doing the killing. However, unlike those in the Israel-Hamas conflicts of 2014, 2021 and 2023-4, these 'disproportions' were evidently not seen as sufficient grounds to provoke outrage or generate solidarity movements in support of the victims of what some have claimed were acts of genocide.

I will in due course examine the arithmetic of disproportionality. But first, let us be clear about fundamentals. Israel is a legal, democratic state founded in 1948 in the wake of the Holocaust. Its legality was underwritten by the United Nations. And whatever its enemies may say, according to international law, specifically Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, Israel has as much right to defend itself from attack as any other sovereign state. Hamas, by contrast, is neither a state nor a democratic movement but one that as its Covenant states, seeks to establish an Islamic theocracy not only in Gaza but in the territory of what is legally the state of Israel. For these reasons, despite objections by Corbyn, Hamas has been banned by the USA, the UK and the EU as a terrorist organisation. It is publicly disowned by its Arab neighbours and deserted in droves by Gazaeans, who are tired of seeing UN and western aid diverted into extensive tunnel-building and daily rocket launchings instead of improving the welfare of the populace. Some have gone so far as to state their preference for living in Israel, even in an Israeli prison, rather than endure the continued rule of Hamas gangsters.

None of this troubled the western anti-Semitic 'popular front' which, without any reservations, backed genocidal terrorists against a legal state and racist despots against the only true democracy in the Middle East. This was only to be expected. What was extraordinary was that even mainstream politicians and the media no less than anti-Israel protestors have been remarkably coy about the official objectives of Hamas. Strange, because they are in no sense a 'hidden agenda' but are clearly spelled out in its founding Covenant of 1988, available online in English in several versions. Bear in mind when reading what follows that this is the founding document of the movement Corbyn described as his 'friends', and praised for being dedicated to 'dialogue' and 'long-term peace and social and political justice', secular goals Corbyn invented for western consumption, because they do not occur anywhere in a text of purely theocratic inspiration. The objective, laws and means of Hamas are proclaimed in Article 8 of the Charter: 'Allah is its goal,

the prophet is its model the *Koran* is its Constitution, *Jihad* is its path and death for the cause of Allah its most sublime belief.' 'Dialogue'? With Corbyn, to be sure. But with *Israel* ? Let us see.

The introduction sets the tone, with its warning that the 'battle [not dialogue] with the Jews will be long and dangerous' and that 'Israel will rise and Israel will remain erect until Islam eliminates [sic] it as it has eliminated its predecessors'. Article 1 defines Hamas as an exclusively Islamic and therefore theocratic movement akin to ISIS: 'Islam is the system. From Islam it reaches for its ideology, fundamental precepts and world view of life, the universe and humanity.' Article 6 pledges that Hamas will 'work towards raising the banner of Islam on every inch of Palestine', leaving scant room for the 'two state solution' which, absurdly, not Hamas but Israel is accused of frustrating. Article 7 demands the extermination of not only the Jews of Israel, but every Jew in the world: 'The time will not come until the Muslims fight the Jews (and kill them) until the Jews hide behind rocks and trees, which will cry, "O Muslim, there is a Jew hiding behind me, come and kill him."' (Bukhari, *Book on Merits and Virtues* [sic] 2593)

It also identifies Hamas as 'one of the links in the chain of *Jihad* in the confrontation with the Zionist invasion', together with the Muslim Brotherhood, the movement courted by President Obama as a force for moderation in the Islamic world. *Quelle illusion*. Article 22 recycles the classic Nazi fantasy of how, by working secretly through numerous agencies ranging from 'Freemasons and Rotary clubs' to 'the press, publication houses, broadcasting and the like', 'Zionist interests' have come to rule the world and, to the same end, 'stood behind the French and communist revolutions'.

Corbyn has also claimed that these same 'Zionist interests', had exerted their pernicious influence on the BBC, and US foreign policy. claims that also feature prominently on Corbynista websites. (Far leftists who chanted 'We are all Hamas now' should have been asked to explain how they could reconcile their support for the authors of this Charter with what Hamas claims is their own membership of this same conspiracy.) Then we have Article 32, which cites the utterly discredited fabrications of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* as proof of its existence:

For Zionist scheming has no end, and after Palestine they will covert expansion from the Nile to the Euphrates. Only when they have completed digesting the area on which they will have laid their hand, they will look forward to more expansion, etc. Their scheme has been laid out in *The Protocols of the [Learned] Elders of Zion* and their conduct is the best proof of what is said there.

There is nothing original about Hamas's belief that the Jews are plotting a world empire with its headquarters in Israel and have created or used left wing political movements to achieve it. This fantasy faithfully echoes Hitler's in *Mein Kampf*. First there is the proof of this plan which, like Hamas, together with so many others, Muslim and infidel alike, Hitler claimed to have discovered in the *Protocols*:

To what extent the whole existence of this people [the Jews] is based upon a continuous lie is shown incomparably by the *Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion* so infinitely hated by the Jews...What many Jews may do unconsciously is here consciously exposed.

What Hitler claimed to have been ‘exposed’ was a secret Jewish plan to conquer the entire world, using as its base a Jewish state in the Middle East. Here too, the Hamas Charter, in Article 32, echoes Hitler’s claim in *Mein Kampf* that he had discovered in Zionism an objective that went far beyond the creation of a Jewish state, as here: (This is very same passage featured on the website of Corbyn’s intimate friend, the founder and chief administrator of the secret group, Palestine Live, Elleanne Green)

For while the Zionists try to make the rest of the world believe that the national consciousness of the Jew finds its satisfaction in the creation of a Palestinian state, the Jews slyly dupe the dumb *goyim*. It doesn’t enter their heads to build up a Jewish state in Palestine for the purpose of living there; all they want is a central organisation for their international world swindle, endowed with its own sovereign rights and removed from the intervention of other states: a haven for convicted scoundrels and a university for budding crooks.

Article 22’s claim that ‘Zionist interests’, ‘stir revolutions in various parts of the globe’ also occurs in *Mein Kampf*:

He [the Jew] approaches the worker, simulates pity with his fate, or even indignation at his lot of misery and poverty, thus gaining his confidence...With infinite shrewdness, he fans the need for social justice, somehow slumbering in every Aryan man, into hatred against those who have been better favoured by fortune, and thus gives the struggle for the elimination of social evils a very definite philosophical stamp. He establishes the Marxist doctrine...Thus there arises a pure movement entirely of manual workers under Jewish leadership, apparently aiming to improve the situation of the worker, but in truth panning their enslavement and with it the destruction of all non-Jewish -people.

Hitler and Hamas were not alone in promoting the *Protocol*’s myth that communism was the unique creation of the World Jewish Conspiracy. Similar endorsements can be found in numerous Roman Catholic pronouncements on the so-called ‘Jewish Question’, many at a time when, with the full knowledge of but without any opposition from the Vatican, Hitler was energetically resolving it. One example must suffice here, from an article in the diocesan journal of Bishop Ivan Saric of Sarajevo, from May 1941:

The Jews have led Europe and the world towards moral and economic disaster. Their appetite grows till only domination of the whole world will satisfy it...Satan aided them in the invention of socialism and communism...The movement of liberation of the world from the Jews is a movement for the renewal of human dignity. Omniscient and omnipotent God stands behind this movement. [Or Allah, depending]

It might seem that Hamas, a movement so fanatically dedicated to the essentially masculine pursuits of *Jihad* and martyrdom, would have little or no place for those Islam considers and treats as the inferior half of humanity. Not so. Article 17 defines the woman’s role, perhaps a little insensitively, as that of the ‘factory of men’. While the industrial imagery might appeal to the left, if one was not conversant with recent trends in feminism, one might wonder how the actual message might sit with its women comrades. After all, confining a woman’s function in life solely to giving birth to male Jihadis sounds for all the world like the role ascribed to wives of royal

and aristocratic dynasties. However, viewed in the 'context' of the strategic goals of Hamas, its purpose was one that every self-respecting Sharia feminist could endorse with a good conscience, since the end product would be more tunnel diggers, human shields and suicide bombers to be martyred in the *Jihad* against the state of apes and swine.

The promulgation of the Hamas Covenant should have left no one interested in such matters in any doubt, least of the world's most powerful statesman, as to the sources of its inspiration, methods and objectives. And yet, on January 9, 2009 the *Guardian* reported that 'the incoming Obama administration is prepared to abandon George Bush's doctrine of isolating Hamas by establishing a channel to the Islamist organisation'. Previously, on May 12, 2008, *The Atlantic* reported that the Hamas leader Ahme Yousef, sensing the way the wind was blowing in the Obama camp, had said 'We like Mr Obama and we hope he will win the election.' I find Obama's illusions in Hamas quite extraordinary. Long before Obama's election in November 2008, Hamas had established a deserved reputation as the most ruthless and bloodthirsty of all the Palestinian movements dedicated to the elimination of Israel, to which it added, the extermination of all its Jews.

The methods Hamas employed to achieve its divinely-sanctioned ends, when first introduced, marked a clear departure from those of pre-existing, semi-secular organisations that shared its goals. We had the death cult of the suicide bomber, conducting what were termed 'martyrdom operations'. The target was almost always a civilian one...a bus, a crowded cafe, a market place. Hamas took these 'operations' very seriously, establishing a suicide bomber 'Academy' in Gaza City where it trained its 'martyrs'. In 2001, during the last surge of suicide attacks on Israel prior to the construction of the Wall, 115 students graduated, no doubt beguiled by the prospect of an eternity of carnal excess. Most, if not all, are now long dead, blown to pieces along with hundreds of Jewish civilian victims.

Yet Hamas was the movement that like Obama, the Sharia left took to its heart more than any other. Defying conventional political logic, we find self-styled leftists, anti-racists, advocates of women's and gay liberation, and all manner of other progressive causes, chanting 'we are all Hamas' in 'solidarity' with a terrorist, theocratic, homophobic, mysongistic movement that emulated Nazi anti-Semitism, denounced the left-wing politics of the as a creation of a global Jewish conspiracy and, quite openly, despised all the aims and principles which had motivated the left since its inception. And, what is more, the anti-Zionist left was only too ready to make all the policy concessions necessary to secure the intimate collaboration it sought with like-minded Muslim organisations in the UK and elsewhere in Europe.

The Sharia left's assessment of Hamas was expounded at some length in a *Socialist Worker* article titled 'Behind the myths About Hamas' by the SWP's Deepa Kumar, dated January 21, 2009, one day after the inauguration of President Obama. One of the 'myths' to be dispelled was that Hamas was anti-Semitic: 'Most mainstream accounts of the Palestinian Hamas organisation present it as bunch of rabid fanatics, bent on violence and motivated by an irrational hatred of Jews and the state of Israel'. Where on earth did that idea come from? Since the writer presents herself as someone who is better informed about Hamas than those responsible for these 'mainstream accounts', we must assume that she was familiar with those articles of its Covenant expressing contrary to her denials, a hatred for Israel and the Jews so profound that the movement made no attempt to conceal that

it sought the destruction of the first (Article 6) and the extermination of the second (Article 7).

As Kumar must surely have read the two articles, we can only assume that she was aware of these objectives. True, she says, the Hamas Charter 'makes little effort [sic] to distinguish between an anti-Zionist and an anti-Jewish stance' (implying the two were incompatible) but the 'experience of fighting the occupation' had enabled Hamas to distinguish between the two. Actually killing Jews, rather than just talking about it, was apparently the best cure for anti-Semitism. If it was the case that Hamas no longer harboured Nazi-style animosity and intentions towards the Jews, why then had it not revised or expunged those Articles of its Covenant that Kumar insisted were no longer consistent with what she claims to be its current stance on these issues? Was she not aware that the supreme leader of Hamas, billionaire Khaled Mashaal, declared on January 25, 2006, that his movement would 'not change a single word in its covenant'? How would she explain away an Al-Aqsa TV broadcast of February 28, 2010, by Abdullah Jarbu, the Hamas Deputy Minister of Religious Affairs, who described the Jews as a 'microbe unparalleled in the world' and, by invoking the authority of Islam's most holy text, continued:

It is not I who say this. The *Koran* itself says, "You shall find the strongest men in enmity to the believers to be the Jews". May he [i.e., Allah] annihilate this filthy people who have neither religion nor conscience. I condemn whoever believes in normalizing relations with them, whoever supports sitting down with them and whoever believes that they are human beings. They are not human beings. They are not people.

Or as the Nazis had it, the Jews are *unttermensch*. This is how Jeremy's 'friends' talk about the Jews when they are at home, as they also do when rejecting suggestions from more moderate voices in the Arab world that Hamas should soften its stance on Israel. On October 26, 2017, when addressing a meeting of Gaza youth, the Hamas leader Yayha Sinwar declared that 'over is the time Hamas spent discussing recognising Israel. [In fact it never did.] Now Hamas will discuss when we will wipe out Israel.' On July 13, 2019, senior Hamas official Fathi Hammad declared in a speech that 'our patience has run out. We are on the verge of exploding. If this siege is not undone, we will explode in the face of our enemies, with God's permission and glory. The explosion is not only going to be in Gaza, but in the West Bank and abroad if God wills...All of you seven million Palestinians abroad, enough of the warming up. You have Jews everywhere and we must attack Jews everywhere on the globe by way of slaughter and killing if God permits.' So much for Corbyn's 'dialogue'.

Kumar's claims about a 'reformed' Hamas were no less lies than Corbyn's about its peaceful intentions. Hamas has continued to act in accordance with the same genocidal hatreds expressed and codified its Covenant in 1988. Yet even after October 7, Corbyn on more than one occasion denied that Hamas was a terrorist movement. Neither was there, as Kumar claimed, any softening of Hamas's attitude towards the Jews. In August 2015, Hamas displayed on its Twitter account a cartoon that like many others of the same provenance, could have been lifted directly from the Nazi *Der Sturmer* edited by the fanatical anti-Semite and executed Nuremberg Trials war criminal Julius Streicher. Directed against Fatah as much as the Jews, the cartoon depicted the ubiquitous hook-nosed Jew raping a

Palestinian woman, while beside her lay the bodies of her two dead children, murdered by the rapist. Nearby, nonchalantly smoking, stood a PA policeman. Could it be only by chance that *Der Sturmer* also regularly featured almost identical cartoons whose one difference was that the rape victim was always a blonde Aryan maiden? Neither is it always a case of imitation. On October 29, 2015, 'moderate' Fatah, the controlling faction of the PLO on the West Bank, posted on its Facebook page a reproduction of the front cover of a 1936 Nazi children's book depicting the classic hooked nosed Jew and a fox, and inscribed with the legend, 'Trust no fox on his green heath, and no Jew on his oath'. But it is the Zionists who are the Nazis of today.

While exonerating the supposedly reformed Hamas of the charge of anti-Semitism, Kumar conceded that Hamas's attitude towards women was 'reactionary.' But Kumar need not have worried on this score either, because as we shall see, Sharia feminists like herself were engaged in either denying or justifying the inferior status of women in Islamic countries as the price for sustaining their common front with Jihadist movements and diaspora Muslim pressure groups. The same applied to gay rights. The cynical attitude underpinning the anti-Zionist left's attitude towards its Islamic partners was captured perfectly as long ago as 2003 by a veteran of the Socialist Workers Party, the feminist (sic) writer and Stop the War Coalition activist Lindsey German. One of the earliest and most enthusiastic advocates of what in party lingo might have been termed the 'turn to Islam'; German understood only too well that the proposed alignment would involve far-reaching policy adjustments: 'Now I'm all in favour of defending gay rights, but [in matters Muslim, there is invariably a 'but'] I am not prepared to have it as a *shibboleth* (sic) *created by people who regard the state of Israel as somehow a viable presence.*' (Emphasis added)

The message was unambiguous. Gay rights, hitherto prominent as a campaigning issue by the left, were now to be seen as an obstacle to joint work with homophobic Muslims. But she went further, much further, pandering to Muslim homophobia by identifying homosexuality, a capital offence under Sharia law, with Israel, where homosexuality is legal, as are gay partnerships, and with those who defend the Jewish state's right to exist. The policy German advocated had within a short time become nigh-on universal not only on the left, but amongst gay rights organisations, placing a so-called 'solidarity' with lethally homophobic Islamic regimes and movements above the defence of gay men and women enduring the most terrible persecution at their hands. So, we had QUIT, Queers Undermining Israeli Terrorism, and the International Gay and Lesbian Rights Commission, who each boycotted the 2006 gay conference in Jerusalem as a gesture of solidarity with regimes and movements that unlike their spurned hosts, regard and in some instances, punish homosexuality as a capital crime.

The lengths to which *dhimmi* gays would go to appease those who would, if they could, put them to death, were quite extraordinary, and smacked (no *double entendre* intended) more of the M in S and M than of straight (if I can use that word) homosexuality. When, in February 2006, the Gay and Lesbian Humanist Association ran an article in its magazine describing Islamic teachings on homosexuality as 'barmy', Peter Herbert, the Chairman of the London-based Race Hate Crime Forum, announced that he would be writing to the Crown Prosecution Service, making his intention clear that he would 'vigorously pursue a prosecution of the editor or writers who had made the racist and degrading comments'. Muslims

a *race*? Calling homophobia 'barmy' '*racist*'? Rather than stand by their innocuous remark, the *dhimmi* GLHA caved in by issuing a grovelling apology and sacking their editor and deputy editor. Even when gays showed their solidarity with Palestine, this was judged to be insufficient if they do not also conform to the Lindsey German formula, as proved to be the case when in May 2004, two gay rights groups, Outrage! and Queer Youth Alliance, took part in a Pro-Palestinian demonstration in London. Evidently not *au fait* with the rules of the game, they carried banners which not only read: 'Israel: Stop persecuting Palestine!' but also: 'Palestine: Stop persecuting queers!' According to an eyewitness, the two offending gay rights contingents were then 'surrounded by an angry, screaming mob of Islamic fundamentalists, Anglican clergy (sic!!!), members of the Socialist Workers Party [what a pairing!], the Stop the War Coalition [Chairman Jeremy Corbyn] and officials from the protest organisers, the Palestine Solidarity Campaign [patron, Jeremy Corbyn], [denouncing them as] racists, Zionists, CIA and MI5 agents and supporters of the Sharon [i.e., Israeli] government.' It is only fair to point out that the SWP's capitulation to Islam and Islamic regimes had been vigorously attacked and even ridiculed by a vocal minority of the far left, especially when, at broad left gatherings, the SWP had voted against resolutions moved in support of gays, women, socialists, students and trade unionists suffering persecution, torture and even death at the hands of Iran's clerical fascists. The pretext given was predictable: solidarity, yes, but with the anti-Zionist, anti-imperialist Ayatollahs, not with those oppressed by them. The contortions of Sharia Left anti-imperialism can be a wonder to behold. During the war between Iran and Iraq, *Socialist Worker* laid down the line: 'We have no choice but to support the Khomeini regime', because the USA was backing Iraq. (A classic example of the tactic much favoured by the far left, 'the enemy of my enemy is my friend'.) But when the west went to war to remove the Ba'athist regime in Baghdad, again deploying the same tactic, there was 'no choice' but to support Iran's enemy, Saddam Hussein. Naz Massoumi explained the motivation behind the SWP's backing of the Iranian theocracy in its monthly *Socialist Review* of February 2009: 'Islamism has filled the vacuum left by the bankruptcy of Stalinism and nationalism in the Middle East. Any Left in Iran or the region must now relate to this reality if it is not to make the same mistakes.' As the author of these lines must have known, firstly, there was no legal 'left' in Iran, or indeed, save for Israel, across the entire Middle East, because it had been annihilated by Islamo-fascist movements and regimes. Contrary to what the SWP claimed, 'Islamism', now supported by the SWP as the only viable anti-western option, had not 'filled a vacuum' but created one. It did this, just as the Nazis did, by the physical elimination of all its political opponents, in the first place, a powerful secular left, which, unlike the exiled Ayatollah Khomeini and his clerical followers, had been at the forefront of the resistance to the Shah's police regime. (See Appendix G)

The Iranian clergy only turned against the Shah when in 1963, in an Atatürkist 'top down' drive to modernise what was still a semi-feudal society, he launched his so called 'White Revolution'. Three aspects of the Shah's reforms especially alienated the Ayatollahs: votes for women, secularised education and the transfer of land from the ownership of the clergy to the impoverished peasantry. Unlike the clergy, the goal of the leftist, liberal and secular currents opposed to the Shah was not the reversal of these measures, but the overthrow of his police regime and the establishment of a western-style democracy that granted civil liberties to all. In a

classic Stalinist 'Salami' operation, once the theocracy had rallied sufficient support among the more devout Islamic masses, it set about creating the 'vacuum' it intended to occupy by mobilising its so-called 'Revolutionary Guards', young fascist, Muslim thugs, to isolate and then round up in stages its former allies of convenience, the liberals, Kurds and the leftists.

The so called 'Islamic Revolution' was, in the traditional leftist sense of the term, a clerical/feudal counter-revolution that by means of a savage terror, over the subsequent years, established a vicious clerical-fascist theocracy with its own expansionist Shi'a agenda. The war of terror waged by the Ayatollahs against their opponents exceeded by far, and still does, that of the Shah's regime, which now seems almost benign by comparison, with periods when there have been an average of three executions per *day*. (Corbyn and Livingstone, both opponents, so they say, of capital punishment, were employed as TV presenters by this regime of holy hangmen.) Under the theocracy so admired by UK leftists, strikes were outlawed, labour leaders murdered, communists executed after forced confessions of treason, elections rigged, the media censored by the clergy, and women regimented by religious police and stoned to death for alleged violations of a seventh century desert misogynistic code. In Iran today, civil liberties are non-existent and torture and rape routine methods of humiliation of political opponents.

In the first decade of the regime, at least ten thousand members of the Tudeh (Communist) Party were arrested and jailed, while most of its leaders, after being tortured, were paraded at televised Stalinist-style show trials where, before being executed, they made pre-rehearsed abject confessions of guilt and declared their conversion to Islam. The first purge was completed by 1984, followed by another in 1988. All told, estimates of those killed are as high as 30,000. This was the regime that from 2009 to 2012, Corbyn, along with other political figures ranging from the far left to the far right, served as a highly paid (£1,250.00 per hour) presenter on Iran's state owned Press TV channel. Today, the killing still goes on, with young women demonstrators mowed down on the streets in the Autumn of 2022 for defying the regime's Islamic dress code. One recent victim of the theocratic terror, the labour activist, Shahrokh Zamani, was murdered in prison after his arrest under fascist laws that ban trade unions and the right to strike. This is the 'reality' to which the Sharia left 'related'...the annihilation of the secular left by Islamic clerical fascism. Put simply, the message of the Sharia Left was, the future in the Muslim world lies with an anti-labour, anti-leftist, anti-secular, mysongistic, anti-democratic, anti-human rights, fascistic Islamic theocracy, and so those under its rule must accommodate themselves to it in the interests of unity in the struggle against Zionism and western imperialism. This strategic turn had multiple causes. With the progressive erosion of its always slender base in the UK labour movement, most of the far left increasingly sought to overcome its isolation by constructing bogus 'anti-imperialist', 'anti-war' and 'anti-racist' popular fronts with reactionary Islamic organisations such as the Muslim Council of Britain and the Muslim Association of Britain, both of which had close ties with the Egypt-based theocratic Muslim Brotherhood and its anti-Semitic terrorist offspring, Hamas. The first such operation, the 'Stop the War Coalition', emerged in opposition to the US-led military campaigns to remove from power the Taliban in Afghanistan and Saddam in Iraq. It was a coalition in name only, being in reality largely the creation of the ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, but, as is customary in such operations, it was fronted as Patrons by two non-

members, Chairmen Andrew Murray of the pro-Moscow Communist Party of Britain, and all-purpose useful idiot, anti-Semite and professional anti-Zionist, Jeremy Corbyn. Those uninformed about the *modus operandi* of such movements might say these were strange choices by self-styled Trotskyists to front their operation, since Murray was an avowed admirer of the Soviet dictator responsible not only for the murder of Trotsky but also, amongst the millions of others who are numbered among his victims, those Bolsheviks who supported his lost battle for the succession after the death of Lenin in 1924, while Corbyn was a frequent contributor to the Muscovite Communist Party of Britain's *Morning Star*. Writing in the same journal on the 120th anniversary of Stalin's birth, Murray conceded, without condemning him, that Stalin had indeed used 'harsh measures' - a euphemism if ever there was one - but asked readers to ponder why it was that 'hack propagandists abominate the name of Stalin before all others'. Could it be because the victims of his terror are now believed to have numbered at least 20 million? And we should remind Murray's *faux* Trotskyist comrades in the Stop the War Coalition that one such 'hack propagandist', Leon Trotsky, described Stalin as 'the dirtiest, the most criminal and most repulsive figure in history'. As for Corbyn, Murray's forty years' membership of the Communist Party, veneration of Stalin, mourning of the passing of the Berlin Wall, and support for what he described, laughably, as 'Peoples [north] Korea' proved no impediment to the Labour Leader appointing him to head his campaign team for the General Election of June 8, 2017.

Footnote: The Rome Statute regarding Human Shields

Wikipedia says the following: regarding the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court:

'The ICC can prosecute individuals (but not states or organisations) for four kinds of crimes: genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and the crime of aggression. These crimes are detailed in Articles 6, 7, 8 and 8 *bis* of the Rome Statute respectively. They must have been committed after July 1, 2002, when the Rome Statute came into effect. The ICC has jurisdiction over these crimes in three cases: first, if they took place on the territory of a State Party [to the Statute], second, if they were committed by a national of a State Party; or third, if they were referred to the Prosecutor [of the ICC] by the UN Security Council.' It continues: 'The only type of immunity the ICC recognises is that it cannot prosecute those under 18 when the crime was committed.'

As regards human shields, Wikipedia says the following:

'Under the Rome Statute, using protected persons [i.e., civilians] as shields in an international armed conflict is a war crime.'

Since there is no statute of limitations for crimes committed under the Rome Statute, by his public advocacy of the deployment of human shields in an international armed conflict, issued after the coming into effect of the said statute, Corbyn, as a citizen of a state which is party to the statute, is liable to prosecution by the International Criminal Court, under the terms of the Rome Statute, for committing a war crime.

3 To Beat or Not to Beat?

Once the Sharia left ditched gay rights, more 'shibboleths' of the left were destined to go the same way, and for the same reasons. In first place there was for Muslim men the least digestible one of all, namely that of women's rights. Beating, as is, or rather, should be well known, at least by feminists, is recommended by the *Koran* (Chapter 4, Verse 34) as a punishment for 'disobedient' wives. One English language translation of the relevant passage runs: 'And as for those [wives] on whose part you fear disobedience, admonish them and keep away from them in their beds and chastise them'. An editorial footnote to the verse expands on this command. According to tradition, the 'Holy Prophet' advised that 'the beating should not be such as to leave any mark on her body.' One does not deliberately damage one's own property. Perhaps embarrassed that the *Koran* unequivocally sanctions what is judged to be a cruel and criminal act by the norms and laws of all civilised countries, some diaspora Islamic authorities have made tortured attempts to gloss the passage in question to make it yield a meaning entirely different from what the text very clearly says and countless millions of Muslim husbands act upon.

One Islamic website, *Islamic Finder*, assures its Muslim readers that the verse in question has been 'greatly [sic] misconstrued by many people who focus merely on the surface meaning [i.e., what it clearly says] taking it to allow wife beating'. Leaving aside the intriguing question as to why so many (we can be sure male Muslim) readers are amenable to interpreting the text as it stands, it is difficult, if not impossible, to see what any other meaning than this can be deduced from its wording. Unless we are confronted here with a code, the 'surface meaning' is the meaning, since there is no other construction that can be put upon the word 'chastise' or, as *Islamic Finder* prefers to translate it, the even stronger and impossible to misconstrue 'beat'. So, as another line of defence, readers are also warned not to rely on a translation from the original Arabic as one is otherwise 'likely to misunderstand it'. Presumably, this must also apply to the English translation provided by *Islamic Finder*. If what *Islamic Finder* says is true, then the unreliability of non-Arabic versions automatically excludes from a true understanding of the *Koran* approximately the 75% of the world's Muslims for whom Arabic is not their mother tongue, quite apart from the more than 50% of the world's Muslims who are illiterate, whether they speak Arabic or not.

After quoting the passage in question, the reader is advised that whatever it might seem to say (and does say), 'this verse neither permits violence nor condones it'. Welcome to the world of Orwell's *1984*, where war is peace, freedom is slavery and now, a beating is not a beating. We are not told by what arcane means *Islamic Finder* was able to arrive at this conclusion. And having confidently assured the reader, in defiance of all semantics and logic, what its words do not mean, *Islamic Finder* inexplicably omits to reveal what it is they *do* mean. After all, given their 'context', what meaning do the two key words 'beat them' convey if not violence against wives? 'Beat', the verb, is a violent action, and 'them' are the wives who are its object. Hard put to find a convincing alternative reading, the passage in question, having been emptied of its only possible meaning, is spirited away, like so many no less barbaric passages in the Bible, into a textual limbo. Even if the Muslim reader were to be provided with the supposedly true meaning, he would be confronted

with two problems, neither of which *Islamic Finder* addresses. First, why did Allah, in a message that he says himself is 'perfect' in all respects (*Koran* 2:3) choose to sow such confusion by conveying to his prophet and thence to all mankind verses that contain a double meaning, and in this case moreover, one which invariably results in the unintended beating of wives? Being perfect, why could he not speak clearly, or, for some unfathomable reason, failing that, at least have provided a method by which verses such as this could firstly be identified and then their true meaning revealed?

Perhaps we have a clue as to Allah's intentions in Chapter 3, Verse 8, which seems to give *carte blanche* to an Islamic version of Biblical textual cherry picking: 'He it is Who has sent down to Thee the Book; in it there are verses that are firm and decisive in meaning, they are the basis of the Book - and there are others that are susceptible of different interpretations.' All very confusing, because this does not square with the claim made by its author in Verse 3 of Chapter 2 that the *Koran* is not only 'a perfect book' but that 'there is no doubt in it'; in Chapter 11, Verse 2, that 'this is a book whose verses have been made firm and free from imperfection'; and in Chapter 39, Verse 24, that 'Allah has sent down the best Discourse, a Book whose verses are mutually supporting.' When the sole purpose is to convey a message to guide the conduct of all mankind, why make parts of it deliberately obscure or ambiguous, and at the same time, claim it is 'firm and free from imperfection' and its parts 'mutually supporting'? Moreover, the reader is given no clear guide as to how to distinguish verses which are 'firm and decisive' from the those that are not. Instead, the author, whoever he might be, issues a warning to be on guard against 'those in whose hearts is perversity pursue such thereof as are susceptible of different interpretations, seeking to cause discord and seeking wrong interpretations of it.' (3: 8) But again, we have the same problem: how to tell a true interpreter, and therefore their true interpretations, from those that are false? Allah's answer still leaves the basic problem unresolved: 'None knows its right interpretation except Allah and those who are firmly grounded in knowledge'. (3: 8) And who these might be is anyone's guess.

Along with umpteen other self-appointed pundits who have set themselves up in business as interpreters of the more obscure utterances of Allah, *Islamic Finder* evidently believes he is one of those endowed with the necessary qualifications. However, he still has the problem of how to reconcile the prophet's injunction, recorded in at least two *Hadith*, (Tirmidhi and Muslim) that 'the beating should not be such as to leave any mark on her body', with his claim that the passage in question does not 'permit and condone' the beating of wives by their husbands. If so, why the command of the prophet not to leave marks on the body? It amounts to this, that there is no escaping the quandary non-literal readings of sacred texts place their exponents in; namely, how does a reader of in this case the *Koran*, even one highly qualified in Islamic theology, distinguish between verses that contain both a surface false meaning and a true one lurking somewhere below, and those that do not? If we ignore the theological minefields such practises traverse, the real purpose of this exercise is easily understood. It becomes evident that the actual process and criteria of selection requires no special skill or great learning. Just as it is the case with 'awkward' passages in the Bible, the same procedure is applied by Muslim clerics and scholars to similar verses in the *Koran* that by western civilised standards are either palpable nonsense or sanction barbaric practices. Once identified, they are on closer inspection conveniently found to contain hidden meanings greatly at variance

with the actual words of the text. Proof that this is indeed the motive and method in both cases is not hard to come by. While no Christian theologian would for one moment consider reading an opposite meaning into the injunctions to 'love thy neighbour as thyself' or 'thou shalt worship no other Gods before me', Genesis on the other hand can be and is quite readily accepted by liberal theologians as an allegory for Hawking's Big Bang and Darwin's *Origin of the Species*. Things can get a little trickier when two key passages from the same source unambiguously proclaim exactly opposite messages, especially when they are taken to be authentic accounts of the sayings and deeds of Jesus. Take Luke for example. In Chapter 18, Verse 20, we have Jesus quoting the Fifth Commandment, 'honour thy father and thy mother'. Yet a little earlier, in Chapter 14, Verse 20, he is saying the exact opposite: 'If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life, he cannot be my disciple'. Hate? Honour? Which is it to be? Since both verses purport to be the actual words of Christ (and therefore of god himself) 'cherry picking' is of no avail here. As they cannot be made to agree, the theologian is left puzzling, since god, being infallible, cannot contradict himself, which of these two sayings does not mean what it says, and no less perplexing, why?

There is nothing especially modern about cherry-picking sacred texts. Despite his insistence, as against the claims of the Papacy, that the whole of Christian teaching was to be found only in the Bible, Luther went in for it wholesale. Although, according to orthodox doctrine, every word of the Bible was inspired, if not like the *Koran* actually dictated, word for word, by god, Luther found the gospel of John 'far superior to the other three, and much to be preferred.' As for James, one of the four brothers, so the Bible tells us, of Jesus (and whose mother, so the Catholic Church assures us, nevertheless remained a virgin until her 'assumption' into outer space and, presumably, beyond), his epistle was 'full of straw'...god obviously having an off day.

While the system of selective alternative readings, at least for the gullible, preserves the infallibility of the sacred text, it does so by incurring the unavoidable risk of leaving the text open to any number of competing interpretations. This of course is exactly what has happened down the ages, with the result that the single, simple word of god now speaks with countless conflicting voices, each accusing all the rest of heresy. *Islamic Finder* is no exception. Though it would have Muslims believe that 'this verse neither permits violence nor condones it', one can view any number of videos where no less qualified Islamic clerics enthusiastically demonstrate to no less appreciative male audiences how wife beating is to be administered and with what implements. On February 6, 2016, Hamas Mufti of Gaza, Hassan Al-Laham, was featured, one hopes also for the enlightenment of *dhimmi* western feminists, on a PA TV programme explaining how Muslim husbands should discipline their wives: 'Allah created a solution for marital strife. Allah said warn them [the wives].and separate from them and hit them and bring an arbitrator from his family and an arbitrator from her family. Only after this comes divorce. The husband starts with a warning.' Wife beating, the Mufti concluded, 'is a kind of [sic] reminder that the love and friendship that Allah commanded is still found between the couple'. But just a moment. Were we not assured by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay that wife beating by Palestinian husbands was caused by the Israeli occupation? And yet it would appear not, because in addition to what the *Koran* says on the subject of wife beating, all the

classic commentaries, together with rulings by modern clerics, who also cite numerous *Hadith*, support the 'surface' reading of the passage in question. It would seem then that on this particular topic, when it comes to doctrinal orthodoxy, both the UN and *Islamic Finder* are on a beating to nothing.

Another tactic, subtler than that of *Islamic Finder's*, since it dispenses with 'surface' meanings, but also, in its own way, equally if not more problematic, is for modern Arabic editions and translations of the *Koran* to introduce textual revisions and additions that seek to navigate a middle course between the authentic rendition of 'awkward' verses such as 4:34 and their total negation. The edition prepared by Yusef Ali, for example, without any scholarly grounds for doing so, and like several others of the same genre, inserts 'lightly' before 'beat', a textbook illustration of oxymoron. One on-line definition of 'to beat' reads: 'Strike (a person or an animal) repeatedly and violently so as to hurt them.' The on-line Oxford dictionary concurs, word for word, except that it adds 'or injure' after 'hurt', while *Webster* is briefer, but to the point: 'To hit repeatedly so as to inflict pain'. How does one 'lightly' inflict 'pain' or 'injury'? As to those approaches that resort to 'readings' and 'contexts', there are of necessity practical limits as to how many hidden meanings or contextualised re-interpretations can be detected lurking beneath the 'surface' of an actual text. First there is the problem of credibility. Who is going to take seriously a religion every word of whose scripture may have to be translated into plain unambiguous Arabic by teams of Sharia code breakers? Most of the text therefore simply has to be anchored in some sort of reality, to be taken to mean what it actually says. The question then is...which is surface, what is 'context', and which is for real?

Here cultural factors, and not only theology, come into play. There was a time when no Muslim scholar would have seen the need to conjure away a passage in the *Koran* or a *Hadith* recommending (not just permitting) the beating of disobedient wives. In many Islamic countries, this still applies today, as witnessed by the instructional videos already referred to. But in the west, where the law and society at large take a dim view of such behaviour, social as well as legal constraints have produced the kind of semantic spoofery practised by *Islamic Finder*, though here too there are limits. A Muslim husband's right, even duty, to beat his wife is derived from a more fundamental tenet of Islam, which it shares with its parent monotheisms, this being the god-given right of men to command women. As we have seen, when circumstances demand it, the first can be glossed over or softened but not, because of its doctrinal primacy, the second. And, as luck would have it, this core belief of Islam in the subordination of women accords with Bible teachings on the same subject, and moreover, does not of itself violate western legal codes (though certain actions derived from it can) and as a bonus, is less at odds with some western male attitudes on this issue than wife beating. This has made it all the easier for diaspora male Muslims and their clerics to embrace without any semantic reservations the 'surface' meaning of another passage in the same verse, even when translated into English: 'Men are guardians over women because Allah has made some excel others'; therefore, 'virtuous women are obedient'. Even though this passage occurs in the same Koranic verse as the one sanctioning wife beating, without explaining why (though we can guess) *Islamic Finder* here takes the 'surface' meaning as its true one: 'It is important that a wife recognises the authority of her husband in the house. He is the head of the household and she is supposed to listen to him.' The already quoted Koranic source provides an editorial footnote to

the text giving two reasons why men must rule women: 'His superior mental and physical faculties' and 'his being the breadwinner and maintainer of the family.' Q.E.D.

Wife beating was also the subject of an article titled 'Can a man beat his wife in Islam?', published in 2021 on the website of a registered UK Islamic charity (sic!), the 'Utrujj Foundation'. Here, the answer was a resounding yes. Wife beating was 'an act of loyalty and love', required when the wife is 'undermining her husband's authority', 'troublesome, causing issues', or when he suspects she might be 'talking to someone behind his back or receiving someone in his home without his permission.' Beating 'must not leave a mark' or 'be on the face.' Husbands had not so much a right as a duty to beat their wives, because 'men are in charge of women, while 'righteous women are devoutly obedient', 'like your (sic!) captives', i.e., slaves. One of the most distressing aspects of Koranic misogyny is that even Muslim women in the diaspora endorse it. Maajid Nawaz, founder of the reformist Quilliam Foundation, can be seen on YouTube vainly attempting to persuade a women caller on LBC that the verse on wife beating must be rejected by modern Muslims, And also bravely, because this is the capital offence of apostasy. Lest it be mistakenly assumed that in these enlightened times Islam, at least in its 'western' versions, no longer upholds the doctrine of female subordination, then a ruling on the status of women under Islam by no less an authority than the current Islamising President of still officially secular Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, should help to clarify the issue: 'In Islam, women are entrusted to men.' Lucky Muslim women, say envious *dhimmi* western feminists. The subordination of women to men therefore is for Muslims, of whatever school of law or branch of the faith, non-negotiable, a fact well understood and even publicly acknowledged by the Sharia left and embraced by western *dhimmi* feminists.

One of the worst abuses of women under Sharia law is its requirement that for an accusation of rape to be proven, it needs the testimony of four male witnesses, that is, four men who watched but did not prevent the rape, perhaps because they were awaiting their turn. This stipulation rests upon Chapter 24, Verses 4 and 13 of the *Koran*, and is re-enforced by a number of *Hadith*, notably Bukhari 5:59:462. Like all other Sharia laws, it is not subject to annulment or revision, only interpretation. One such was provided by the *Islam Web*, dated May 15, 2011. (*Fatwa 156817*) A daughter aged 14 related that her father had been sexually abusing and raping her since the age of nine and sought redress. Back came the answer: 'The crime of *zina* ['coercive adultery'] is not confirmed except if the father admits it, or with the testimony of four trusted men, while the testimony of the woman is not accepted.' Next case please. Then we have marital rape. Outlawed, disgracefully, as late as 1991, in England and Wales, and in Scotland, where it has never been legal, the concept simply does not exist under Islamic law, the reason being that the *Koran* explicitly entitles husbands to have sexual intercourse with their wife/wives whenever the fancy takes them. As in all other religions, so in Islam, the standpoint adopted is that of the man: 'Your wives are a sort of tilth [sic] for you, so approach your tilth when and as you like'. (Chapter 2, Verse 223) But in order to resolve any doubts readers may have as to the conjugal rights of Muslim men, I refer them to Sheikh Abu Sayeed, President of the Islamic Sharia Council in Britain, the body that with government approval, supervises Sharia courts dispensing an Islamic 'justice' that, as in this instance, is often in conflict with UK law. He gave this ruling in October 2010: 'Clearly [sic] *there cannot be any rape*

within marriage', because 'when they get married, the understanding was that sexual intercourse was part of the marriage'. (Emphasis added) Even when, quote, 'aggression', that is, force, was used to secure compliance with the husband's desires, this still did not, in senior cleric Sayeed's judgment, constitute rape. This ruling rests, as it has to, on a sound Islamic foundation. In the revered 14th century manual on Islamic law by Ahmad ibn Naqib al Misri, *The Reliance of the Traveller*, we read in section M 5.1, under the heading, 'Conjugal Rights': 'It is obligatory for a woman to let her husband have sex with her immediately [sic] when: a) He asks her; b) at home; c) She can physically endure [sic] it'. Let the last word on this subject fittingly rest with the prophet himself, one which gives us at the same time an insight into Islam's stance on the no less taboo subject of slavery. According to the highly respected *Hadith* collection of Sahih Bukhari, in 6: 60: 466, as authenticated by Abdullah bin Zama, Mohammed said the following: 'It is not wise for anyone of you to lash his wife like a slave, for he might sleep with her the same evening'. Not 'wise'...but not *haram* either. Lash a slave as hard and for as long as one likes, but as for a wife (or wives), not as you would a slave, just in case you fancy some 'tilthing'. No doubt a self-appointed authority on this *Hadith's* true 'reading' will explain that lash does not mean lash and maybe even that slave does not mean slave, etc. etc.

Man is indeed the master of woman in all things, because Islam is, like the other two monotheisms, only even more so, very much a man's religion. But with this crucial difference. Far more Muslim men than observant Jews and practising Christians still use their faith as a god-sent justification and opportunity to treat their womenfolk as sexual and domestic slaves, even though the Bible has no more sympathy for the idea of equality of the sexes than the *Koran*: Genesis 3: 16, 'thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee', and Paul;

For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man.... Let your [sic] women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law. And if thy will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in church. (Corinthians 1, 12: 8-9; 14: 34-34)

Thus saith the law. But today, women today do speak in church, as Pastors, Vicars and even Anglican Bishops, and in synagogues as Rabbis. But not in mosques as imams, mullahs or Ayatollahs. Paul continues, in Ephesians 5:22-23: 'Wives, submit yourselves unto you husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church: and he is the saviour of the body.' And in Timothy 2:11-12: 'Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.' But, unlike in the *Koran* and Sharia law, there is no sanctioning in Paul or anywhere else in the Bible for that matter, of wife beating (though there is of rape). It is also worth noting that Bible scholars have long believed that the misogynistic passages in Paul could be spurious, since they clash with others in Paul that describe crucial roles entrusted to women in Christian missions of the period. Genuine or not, Biblically-based prejudices against women carry no legal weight in modern western society, whereas the opposite is the case in the world of Islam. However, while the Bible does not sanction wife beating, the current edition

of the Roman Catholic *Catechism* does advocate the regular beating of boys by their father: 'He who loves his son will not spare the rod'.

In addition to sanctioning wife-beating and marital rape, there are the punishments Islam prescribes for those women who stray from the path laid down by Sharia law. The Ayatollahs of Iran, whose anti-Zionist steadfastness was so admired by the SWP and the Corbynista left, also show the way here. Stonings of women charged with adultery are conducted according to very strict rules. An illustrated guide to stoning issued by Corbyn's employers, and reproduced by Amnesty International, applies what can be described as the Goldilocks system, displaying pictures of three sizes of stones. The largest are not to be used, because death will come too quickly...what sort of a punishment is that? The small stones will not kill at all and therefore should not be thrown either. As Article 104 of Iran's Penal Code stipulates, 'the size of stone used in stoning shall not be too large to kill the convict by one or two throws, and not be too small to be called a stone.' That leaves the medium sized stones, which will kill...but slowly, for as Allah repeatedly reminds us in the *Koran*, he is 'compassionate, gracious and merciful'.

With the Afghan and Iraqi conflicts of the early 2000s propelling much of the far left towards joint 'Stop the War' actions with UK Muslim organisations, where did all this leave our leftist feminists? What was to take priority...the rights of women, or a so-called 'anti-imperialism', which denied, ignored and even excused the oppression of women by regimes that were deemed to be resisting the west? A straw in the wind was to be found in a book, *The Whole Woman*, by the feminist author and self-styled Marxist Germaine Greer, published in 1999. There she argued that attempts to stigmatise and outlaw the barbaric practice of female genital mutilation inflicted on countless millions of young girls in the Islamic world and also beyond it constituted 'an assault [sic] on cultural identity', but not, so it would seem, on a girl's body. By the same reasoning, so was the outlawing of the no less quaint Hindu custom of widow burning, or *sati*, by the British Governor General of India in 1827. To the same end, Greer's misogynistic multi-culturalism was deployed by Uman Narayan, and the reviewer of his book, *Dis/locating Cultures/Identities, Traditions and Third World Feminism*, by Azfar Hussain. The gist of this work is that American feminists who attack the ritual killing and '[insufficient] dowry murder' of Asian women are themselves guilty of what Hussain terms 'serving the hegemonic', that is, seeking to impose western values on cultures other than their own. If only... Those whose brains are not befuddled and pickled by the moral nihilism of 'cultural relativism' and its ever-multiplying politically correct analogues would argue that female genital mutilation is a brutal assault on a young woman's body, one not only excruciatingly painful, terrifying and humiliating, but also one that condemns her to a lifetime devoid of normal sexual gratification...which of course is exactly the purpose of the vile procedure. Some Islamic clerics, perhaps embarrassed by growing public awareness that although illegal, FGM is rife in the 'vibrant Muslim community', have claimed the practice has no basis in Islamic law. However, other clerics insist that it has. The website of Shaylih Muhammed Saalih al Munajjid, *Islam Question and Answer*, is just one of several Islamic authorities that cite the required sources to prove it. In reply to the question, 'could you explain [to] me what the medical benefit [sic] is of girl's circumcision?', our learned authority replies: 'Circumcision is one of the Sunnahs of the fitrah, as is indicated by the words of the prophet: "The fitrah is the five things - circumcision, shaving the pubes, plucking the armpit hairs, cutting the

nails and trimming the moustache." Female circumcision has not been prescribed for no reason, rather there is wisdom [sic] behind it and it brings many benefits.' One of the 'benefits' listed was that it 'reduces excessive [female] sexual desire'. (There is no equivalent Islamic ruling obliging Muslim man to undergo an analogous operation whose purpose is to produce the same effect.) Here too, *Reliance of the Traveller* allows for no doubt: 'Circumcision is obligatory for both men and women'. (Section E, 4.3) This has certainly been the case not only in primitive Islamic states such as Somalia, but even in Egypt. In May 2015, Minister of Health Adel Adawy revealed that 92% of Egyptian married women have been genitally mutilated, even though the practice had been outlawed since 2008. The Minister also reported that around half of Egyptian women, mainly it would appear in rural areas, still approved of FGM, while only 30% approved of the law banning it.

If the anti-Zionist left was to make a success of its alliance with Islam, arguments similar to Greer's 'cultural sensitivity' and 'diversity awareness' would have to be deployed and extended across an entire range of issues relating to the oppression of women by Muslim men and sanctioned by Sharia law. And sure enough, the adjustments that were called for were indeed made...and who better to make them than another professional feminist? In an article on the subject of Muslim wife-beating in the *Guardian* (where else?), Lindsey German, then a leading member of the Socialist Workers Party, explained that non-Muslim men abuse their partners too...so what was all the fuss about? Raising such issues as a reason for not collaborating with Muslim organisations that justify the abuse of women 'indicated a form of racism, a desire to hold their organisations at arm's length for the flaws [sic] which we, in some measure, tolerate in ours.' So now it was 'racist' to object to Muslim wife-beating and marital rape. Of course, it is true that some infidel men beat and rape their partners. But the difference is, not with the approval of either UK law, the Church of England, public opinion or most of the left. I say 'most' because in 2012, German's party would find itself engulfed in a scandal after its leadership attempted to cover up allegations of the rape of women members by its National Secretary, who went by the name of Comrade Delta. Aptly so, because it dealt a blow to his party's reputation on the left from which it has thus far failed fully to recover.

Shutting one's eyes to the Islam-sanctioned oppression of women has its own logic and momentum. Where does it stop? With female genital mutilation, prescribed in several *Hadith*? 'Honour killing' of girls and women? Murdering rape victims? Child marriage? Aborting of female fetuses and killing female babies? Whatever their status in Sharia law or Muslim 'culture', these are not 'flaws' but primitive, barbaric practices in the eyes of UK public opinion and the law, although in many cases, their perpetrators escape prosecution. A House of Commons Select Committee report on Female Genital Mutilation, published in March 2015, revealed that in one Birmingham hospital alone, the Heartfield, there had been 1,500 cases of post FGM treatment in the previous five years, at a rate of six per week, yet not a single prosecution...an exemplary case of 'cultural sensitivity'. Birmingham is, of course, a city with a very high proportion of Muslim settlement, around 25% of its total population. Just as in the numerous cases of organised Muslim gang rape and pimping, the various agencies that should have been detecting, reporting, prosecuting and thus preventing this abominable crime devised all manner of pretexts to do nothing about it. After all, it was never going

to happen to their daughters. And who in their right mind wanted to risk being accused of racism or Islamophobia? Then there was the ever present danger of provoking a backlash against the imposition of alien secular norms and laws on a 'community' steeped in the mores and practices of a seventh century Arabian desert.

Respect for 'diversity' cut no ice with the Select Committee. Its report complained that 'while agencies play pass the parcel, young girls are being mutilated every hour of the day'. Despite its being outlawed in the UK since 1985 and carrying a maximum prison term of 14 years, unlike in secular France, with its policy of zero tolerance and jailing of offenders, at the time of writing, of a total of an estimated 150,000 cases of FGM, there had been *only one* successful prosecution. No doubt this pleased the *dhimmi* SWP, which its on-line issue of *Socialist Worker* of February 18, 2014 had argued, jettisoning yet another feminist shibboleth, that 'criminalisation [of FGM] was not the way forward'. Please read that again... 'not the way forward'. It would also have been a source of gratification for SWP feminists that FGM in the UK is not only practised, but quite openly recommended without any legal consequences. In 2018, there were two cases where private companies, perhaps motivated by the need to be seen to be promoting 'inclusivity' and 'diversity', lent their support to a crime which carries a maximum prison sentence of 14 years. Twitter, which censors tweets deemed 'Islamophobic', had no problem with a tweet by Dawood Bohra Women for Religious Freedom (sic) promoting FGM. The video showed member Arwa Schiangpurwala saying that 'my daughters have also undergone khatz [FGM] and they're growing up as perfectly as other children of their age. As a mother, I can never do anything to harm them.' For its part, in the same multi-cultural cause, Amazon funded the UK-based 'Muslim Research and Development [sic] Foundation', which supports not only FGM but another crime, child marriage, and for good measure, stoning adulterers to death.

The full implications of this policy of appeasing and even financing the darkest recesses of Islam, and the degree to which it has permeated a much broader milieu than the Sharia left, including the police, council politicians and officers, school teachers and welfare and social workers, have been exposed in a series of criminal cases involving organised Muslim grooming, trafficking, rape and pimping gangs. Operating over a period more than three decades, and mainly in northern cities with large Islamic minorities, they were allowed to ply their filthy and totally illegal trade unhindered for so long only because those whose job it was to be reporting or preventing it either feared that doing so would result in accusations of racism, or were so brainwashed by multi-cultural and cultural relativist ideology that they actually believed that reporting and preventing the gang rape of white children by Muslims was indeed racist. The practical application of the Lindsey German doctrine of casting overboard long-established western 'shibboleths' by ignoring, excusing, or justifying male Muslim abuse of women led to tens, possibly even hundreds of thousands of non-Muslim girls, some no older than ten (but a year older, so Islamic accounts tell us, than the age of Aisha at the time of the consummation of her marriage to Mohammed) being reduced to sexual slavery, thereby becoming effectively non-Muslim concubines as sanctioned both by *hadith*, for example Bukhari 1:8:367, and by Allah in person in the *Koran*, Chapter 4, Verse 4. (See Chapter 27 for details)

A *dhimmi* is a non-Muslim who agrees to pay a tax and live under Islamic rule as a second-class subject. A classic example of how the post-shibboleth *dhimmi* left adjusted itself to its new milieu was provided by a 'Stop the [Iraq] War' meeting in Yorkshire. German described how Muslim women 'sat in a segregated area at the rear of the gymnasium, with a screen which permitted [!] them to see the stage, but not to be seen by men in the hall', presumably a precaution against their being gang raped *en masse*. The same practice was enforced on Sharia left demonstrations, with *dhimmi* women not only sporting hijabs, but marching alongside their Muslim sisters in an all-female contingent segregated from male marchers. This must have been what German meant when she advocated 'reach[ing] out beyond the traditional left'. And so, step by step, secular leftism was discarded as the SWP and similar Islamophile groups cleared the decks for combined 'solidarity' actions with UK Muslim pressure groups in support of their new Jihadist allies, first Hezbollah, Al-Qaeda and the Taliban and then, more recently, Hamas, Al Shabaab, Boko Haram and ISIS. A fitting comment on the SWP's ditching of its feminist 'shibboleths' is that no fewer than four and possibly as many as nine female members made accusations of either rape or sexual assault against leading male members, charges that in each case, like the crimes of the UK's Muslim gang rapists, were swept under the carpet. Mass resignations followed, leaving the SWP with an estimated 200 active members and an alliance with a religion that shared its views on the subordination and sexual abuse of women. The ultimate humiliation came in 2014 when, in the wake of the rapes scandal, the University of London Students Union denied the use of its facilities for the annual SWP 'Marxist' event, on the grounds the party was a 'corrupt, rapist apologist organisation'. Comradeship evidently has its limits, even if solidarity with Hamas anti-Semites was not one of them.

Like other movements of its kind, a *l'outrance* 1970s feminism was born in the USA. However, so was cultural relativism. One of its manifestations was the justification by younger American feminists of the many ways in which their Muslim sisters were oppressed by Islam. One example of many must suffice, provided by Dr Laura Briggs, Associate Professor of that spoof subject, Women's Studies, at the University of Arizona. In an address she gave in 2009, entirely in accordance with the Chomsky rule, she praised the work of academics who like herself, had 'confronted the legacies of a long history of orientalism and the recent wars in the Middle East [and] the way we are invited to see Muslim women as hopelessly, painfully oppressed, without their own autonomy, will, or individual rights.' Again, we ask, wherever could an absurd idea like that have possibly come from? Of course, 'Orientalism', the sins of which we will revisit in due course. But there are also surely to be considered the opinions of the prophet himself on this subject, regarded by all Muslims, at least until the emergence of Professor Briggs, as the world's leading authority on the status of women under Islam. In addition to what the *Koran* says on this hotly contested subject, among the many references in the *Hadith*, there is one from the collection of Bukhari, regarded by Muslims scholars as the most reliable, that gives us at least a clue as to what Mohammed might have thought about Professor Briggs' notion of a Muslim woman's 'personhood'. As the story goes, Mohammed encounters a group of women on his way to prayer. There then ensue the following highly instructive exchanges:

O women, give alms, as I have seen that the majority of the dwellers of Hell are you. They asked, "why is it so, O Allah's apostle?" He replied, "You curse frequently and

are ungrateful to you husbands. I have not seen anyone more deficient in intelligence and religion than you. A cautious, sensible man could be led astray by some of you.” The women asked, “O Allah’s Apostle! What is deficient in our intelligence and religion?” He said, “is not the evidence of two women equal to the witness of man?” [Strange to see Allah’s messenger resorting to a circular argument to prove his point, since it was the prophet himself who decreed this law.] They replied, in the affirmative. He said, “this is the deficiency in her intelligence. Isn’t it true that a woman can neither pray nor fast during her menses?” The women replied in the affirmative. He said, “this the deficiency in her religion”. (Bukhari, *The Book of Menses* [sic], *Hadith* 301.)

This belief in the ‘deficiency’ of women is shared by the Roman Church: ‘Socially man is superior; that God intended this is shown by man’s physical and intellectual equipment’. (*The Catholic Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, p. 559) I could be wrong, but I doubt very much whether Professor Briggs, or for that matter any Sharia feminist, in the course of her highly romanticised and imaginary excursions into the world of Islam, which owe more to the legends of the Arabian nights than the misogynist hells of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sudan, Yemen, Iran, the Islamic State and Saudi Arabia, has ever undertaken, as academics should, a serious study of the basic texts upon which rest the laws and conventions that determine the legal status and ‘personhood’ of her Muslim sisters. If she had, then it makes her enthusiasm for the status of women under Islam even more extraordinary and culpable.

This inability or refusal to see Islamic misogyny for what it is has led those like Professor Briggs, who doubtless enjoys all the individual freedoms that her United States citizenship, laws and constitution entitle her to, to argue that denying these rights to her Muslim sisters is no bad thing. In fact, it can be a blessing...so long as you are Muslim woman. She asks, as if there could be only one possible answer for any right-thinking western feminist, ‘What if community is as much as *or more than* the notions of individual rights, a route to living meaningfully? Perhaps we ought to rethink the idea that women’s agency and personhood spring from *resistance to subjection*.’ (Emphasis added) I ask the reader to read this statement again, which should leave one blinking in disbelief, and then try to imagine what would have been the reaction if Professor Briggs had recommended the passive submission of American women to male domination to an audience of 1970s vintage US feminists. What kind of a ‘meaningful living’ and ‘personhood’ is it for a woman born and trapped for life in a patriarchal culture that denies her right to personal freedom and equality with men, and inflicts the most abominable punishments which, if one has the stomach for it, one can witness on YouTube videos, on any women daring to display her ‘resistance to subjection’? Leaving her second sentence, and its meaning, virtually intact, it can be re-cast to reflect the thinking of an apologist for slavery in Confederate America: ‘Perhaps we ought to rethink the idea that a black slave’s agency and personhood springs from resistance to subjection’. What Professor Briggs seems to have in mind for Muslim women is a far more extreme version of the traditional role once allotted to German women by their misogynistic menfolk, *Kinder, Kuech, Kirche*, with polygamy, FGM, child marriage and the occasional marital beating and rape thrown in.

The reader may well ask themselves - how can a professional feminist provide blanket approval for the total male domination and even enslavement of women? Yet there is no mystery here. The answer is quite simple and will become yet more so as we penetrate ever deeper into the morally depraved and topsy turvy world of

Sharia leftism. What the reader will learn on this journey, if they have not realised it already, is that once Islam, the religion of peace, enters into any political, cultural or social equation, everything changes, in the first place, the situation of women and then, the Jews. In this world inhabited by *dhimmi* leftists, the reader will discover that not only do feminists defend misogyny and gays homophobia, but anti-racists collaborate with anti-Semites, anti-Nazis with admirers of Hitler and peace campaigners with Jihadi terrorists, while writers defend censorship, secularists, theocracy, atheists, religious mumbo-jumbo and so on. Here we find feminists arguing that female 'subjection' (so long as it is to a Muslim male) is not to be resisted, but embraced as another, perhaps superior, route to a woman's 'personhood', whatever that might mean. In Professor Briggs, we have the authentic voice of Sharia left Selective Feminism, which vociferously demands that the concerns and rights of white, middle class western women must be protected and in the USA, even favoured by the laws of their lands, while at the same time justifying the denial of these rights to women infinitely less fortunate than themselves simply because they are Muslims. Not only that. As in our second case, western feminists even vilify as racists western men who do speak out against the oppression of their Muslim sisters.

Whereas the suffragette and feminist pioneers staked their claim to women's rights and equality on their shared humanity with men, the school of Professor Briggs defines, delimits and defends a women's place in society by the culture, or 'community', into which by pure chance, and in this instance, misfortune, they have been born. The unstated assumption is that there are no universal human rights, only those defined by inherited (and predominately male-determined) cultural norms. For all its anti-imperialist, anti-racist rhetoric, Sharia feminism is therefore deeply reactionary, an ideological justification for an enslavement of Muslim women by Muslim men which (one assumes) its western apologists would not endure for one moment from any non-Muslim male partner. Meanwhile, as Muslim women explore their richer version of 'meaningfulness' and 'personhood' as the passive, unresisting objects of stonings, beheadings, marital rapes and beatings, genital mutilations, humiliating dress codes, and forced and child marriages, to name but a few of their offerings, Dr Laura Briggs continued to enjoy hers as Associate Professor of Women's Studies at Arizona University.

Aside from Saudi Arabia and the Islamic State, there is no better example of the 'personhood' (an unfortunate term, given that countless millions of Muslim women are terrorised into covering their persons with a sack topped by a hood) enjoyed by women under Sharia law than Corbyn's Press TV employer from 2009 to 2012, the Islamic Republic of Iran. Its principles were enumerated by the theocracy's former President, the supposedly 'moderate' Hashemi Rafsanjani:

Equality does not take precedence over justice. One of the mistakes the Westerners make is to forget this. Justice does not mean that all laws must be the same for men and women. The difference in the stature, vitality, voice, development, muscular quality and physical strength of men and women show that men are stronger and more capable in all [sic] fields. Men's brains are bigger so [sic] men are inclined to fight and women are more excitable. Men are inclined to reasoning and rationalism, while women have a fundamental tendency to be emotional. The tendency to protect is stronger in men, whereas most women like to be protected. Such differences affect the delegation of responsibilities, duties and rights.

According to Ayatollah Mutahari, one of the leading ideologues of Iran's 'Islamic [counter] Revolution', 'The specific task of women in this society is to marry and bear children. They will be discouraged from entering legislative, judicial, or whatever careers which may require decision making, as women lack the intellectual ability and discerning judgment required for these careers.' What say you, Dr. Laura Briggs, Associate Head of the Department of Women's Studies at Arizona University? Such too were the arguments once deployed in the west by opponents of female suffrage in particular and equality for women in general. In the world of Islam, where Professor Briggs believes women enjoy a richer and more rewarding life than in the west, these reactionary prejudices are not only alive and well, but today underpin the laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran, one of which requires that

a woman should endure any violence or torture imposed on her by husband for she is fully at his disposal. Without his permission, she may not leave her house even for good action, such as charitable work. Otherwise, her prayers and devotions will not be accepted by God and curses of heaven and earth will fall upon her.

The reasons why so many western 'feminists' refuse to acknowledge and campaign against the oppression of their sisters by Islamic regimes and Muslim men generally boil down to just one. Denouncing anti-female Islamic teachings and practices, such as female genital mutilation, forced, bigamous, and child marriages, wife beating and martial rape, all illegal in the civilised world but sanctioned by Islam, is judged to be yet another manifestation of 'Islamophobia', serving the interests of imperialism and Zionism by diverting attention away from the evils of the western world, one ruled by a 'white patriarchy' that has to be fought tooth and nail. Since it denies, and as a result, fails to speak out against the vile oppression of their Muslim sisters, and even actually celebrates it with hijab, burka and burkini 'days', what today goes by the name of radical feminism in its 'third wave' and 'me too' guises is, in its effects, a justification and defence of Islamic misogyny. Thus we have our second case study, that of the UK *dhimmi* feminist Laurie Penny. Writing in (again, naturally) the Shariaphile *Guardian* on December 22, 2013, in an article titled, *This Isn't Feminism, it's Islamophobia*, and subtitled, 'I am infuriated by white men stirring up anti-Muslim prejudice to derail debate on western sexism', Penny from the outset confronted her readers with the unproven because unprovable axiom that those who expose and oppose the Islamic oppression of women are not genuine supporters of women's liberation, but 'Islamophobes', male chauvinists and, as we shall see, probably racists into the bargain. Let us first remind ourselves of what this 'anti-Muslim prejudice' seems to consist of. First, it is drawing attention to those passages in the *Koran* (and to those we should add the relevant *Hadith*) and clauses in Sharia law which sanction what is, by modern western (and, once upon a time, feminist) standards, the physical abuse of and discrimination against women, such as rape within marriage, wife beating, genital mutilation, second class legal status in matters of family and property law, employment restrictions and oppressive dress codes. Secondly, it is the exposure, and reporting of these abuses of women by Muslim men, perpetrated not only in Islamic countries, but in the Muslim diaspora. Other abuses of and crimes against females include stoning to death for alleged sexual offences, the sexual enslavement and even auctioning of captured girls and women, 'honour' killings, the aborting of female foetuses and

murder of baby girls, forced child (60% in Bangladesh) and consanguine marriages (above 50% in Pakistan), the murder of rape victims and the grooming and trafficking of vulnerable young girls for exploitation by Muslim rape and pimping gangs.

In the order of priorities, when comparing the atrocious treatment of women under the rule of Islam with the status of women in the contemporary civilised world, where women are, certainly in the case of member states of the European Union and North America, nowhere subject to discriminatory laws, one would automatically assume that in the name of simple human compassion and international sisterly solidarity, western feminists would devote at the very least most, if not all of their efforts and resources to activities on behalf of their cruelly abused Muslim sisters. Laurie Penny does not agree. Again, we have the Chomsky rule, this time in its feminist application. The fight is exclusively at home, against 'structural sexism', which I assume to mean discrimination against women, a phenomenon that has no legal foundation and when and where it does occur, does not involve acts of male violence, and certainly nothing as barbaric as being buried up to the neck and stoned to death by crowds of baying Muslim men recording the scene on their smart phones.

In accordance with the already-cited Chomsky principle, it is against the domestic enemy alone that all the forces of radical feminism must now be concentrated, the enemy being the (white, naturally) patriarchy. That is why Penny is outraged that feminists should be asked to 'drop all our campaigns and stand against "radical Islam"', a demand that 'sounds more like white patriarchy trying to make excuses for itself: "If you think we're bad, just look at these guys"'. The 'guys' that she defends against such an outrageous slander are Muslim men who rape and beat their wives, 'honour murder' and genitally mutilate their daughters, sexually enslave little girls, and stone women to death for alleged infractions of Sharia law.

The real 'bad guys' are the non-raping, non-beating, non-burying alive, non-stoning, non-child rapist white 'structural sexists' of the patriarchal imperialist west. Hence her refusal to countenance dropping 'all our campaigns' here in UK against this same white patriarchal 'structural sexism', the assumption presumably here being that in the Islamic world, Muslim women, unlike their less fortunate western sisters, are having such an easy time they have no need of western feminist solidarity. Yet it is all too obvious that what she grandly refers to as 'all our campaigns' are those conducted by privileged overwhelmingly white middle and upper middle-class feminists on behalf of privileged, overwhelmingly white middle-and upper-middle class women, the classic bourgeois feminist narcissism encapsulated and often expressed by the single word 'me'.

Rather like the upper-class anti-Semites of the British Foreign Office who either ignored or refused to give credence to reports of the Holocaust, dismissing them as, quote, Jewish 'sob stories', in the best Chomsky tradition, Penny rejects as, quote, 'horror stories', false reports of, quote, 'Muslim misogyny', these being, we asked to believe, fictions concocted by 'western patriarchs to justify imperialism abroad and sexism at home'. If this is so, what are we then to make of videos of women being flogged, stoned to death and beheaded by the Islamic patriarchy? Of videos showing Muslim clerics instructing men how to beat their wives? Could they be fakes, just as Holocaust deniers claimed that images of Nazi death camps were filmed in Hollywood by Jewish directors? Can Penny be so gullible that she is prepared to believe that there is at work here an Islamophobic World White

Patriarchal Conspiracy? Everything that she says suggests that she is. She tells us that she is a 'white feminist infuriated by white men using dog-whistle Islamophobia [sic] to derail any discussion of structural sexism'. Penny even regurgitates Lindsey German's insistence that men in the west treat women no better than Muslim men do in the east. Anyone who says otherwise is *ipso facto* part of a western White Patriarchal Conspiracy.

Those who make 'distinctions between nice, safe western sexism and scary, heathen [sic] Muslim sexism', claims Penny, 'don't care about women'. In fact, they 'care' more about Muslim women than do the Pennys for the very obvious reason that their plight is infinitely worse than the most discriminated against western white feminist, while 'caring' Sharia feminists explicitly exclude them from their concerns, focusing instead exclusively on their noisy mock battle against a domestic 'structural sexism' that despite its alleged all-pervasiveness, still provides a column in a national daily newspaper to complain about it, a facility not generally available to their sisters in the misogynistic realm of Allah.

Penny dismissed proven accounts and even videoed images of the most atrocious abuse of Muslim women as 'horror stories'. (Not, I submit, coincidentally, the very same two words Corbyn's Press Officer, Seumas Milne, used, also in the *Guardian*, to dismiss accounts of the Stalin terror.) Instead, Penny preferred to rail against 'white patriarchs' who are 'stoking controversy, attacking Muslims [actually, only Muslim men] and shouting down feminists of all stripes'. But what is wrong with 'controversy'? Some would find Penny's denial of and acquiescence in the misery of women under Islam a shade 'controversial', especially those who have experienced it at first hand.

As for 'attacking Muslims', should Muslim men who abuse women not be 'attacked' for such behaviour? Why should they get a free pass, just because of their skin colour and religion? Is this what is meant by only 'punching upwards'? If western patriarchs are fair game, why not eastern ones? Finally, precisely who is 'shouting down feminists of all stripes' when they have ready access to the pages of the *Guardian*? The feminists who need answering, not 'shouting down', are precisely those who, like Penny, Greer, Briggs and German, by placing the defence of Islam before and above everything else, betray the cause of the world-wide emancipation of women.

Penny concludes her extraordinary exposition of the basic principles of *dhimmi* feminism with this rallying call: 'For decades, western men have hijacked the language of women's liberation to justify Islamophobia. If we care about the future of feminism, we cannot let them set the agenda'. The enemy, the only enemy, is therefore 'at home, 'white', 'western men', especially those who 'hijack', that is, support the cause of women's liberation, not in their own countries, where the battle has been won, but above all in the Islamic world, where it has barely begun, and where for a Muslim woman to suggest that it should continue invites the most terrible retribution.

4 Disproportionate?

One of most frequently encountered features of the leftist accommodation with Jihadi Islam is the claim that movements such as Hamas and Hezbollah are not terrorists waging a war of elimination against Israel and extermination against Jews, but Arab militias simply 'resisting' Israeli aggression. Yet as we will see, both Hezbollah in its Manifesto, Hamas in its Covenant, and pronouncements by their leaders, are quite explicit: they are both waging a holy war of aggression, conquest, elimination and extermination. In what sense, then, is Israel's response to this war 'disproportionate' and, if it is, what might be a proportionate one? The criteria used to prove that Israel's response to Hamas attacks in the Gaza wars of 2014 and 2021 were 'disproportionate' are twofold:

1) The disparity of 'body counts', especially of civilian victims, an argument vigorously promoted by the professional anti-Zionist and Guru of the numbskull anti-US left, Noam Chomsky. Israel was accused of deliberately, or at the very least, needlessly killing civilians in Gaza, whilst protecting its own civilians from Hamas rockets with the 'Iron Dome' anti-rocket defence system. What then was Israel supposed to do? Israel's critics failed to provide an answer. To satisfy those who seemed to be implying that Israel was defending itself too effectively, one solution might have been for Israel to create a more level playing field by de-activating its Iron Dome, thereby upping the number of its civilian deaths to that of Gaza. To the same end, these proponents of 'even-handedness' could have suggested Israel should cease all other military actions and only reply, rocket-for rocket, tunnel-for-tunnel, kidnapping for kidnapping, suicide bombing for suicide bombing, in the exact quantities fired, dug, kidnapped or suicide-bombed by Hamas.

Theoretically, the result, measured in casualties, should be a draw. And yet, is this so absurd? The United Nations Human Rights Council, with its permanent built-in majority of states that trample on human rights, and in the case of its Muslim members, has since 1990 explicitly repudiated them, accused Israel of committing what it described laughably as the 'war crime' of not sharing its Iron Dome technology with Hamas. By the same reasoning, in the Second World War, the Allies could likewise have been accused of having committed a 'war crime' by not sharing their technical known-how (for example the atomic bomb) with the Axis powers. There is a simple solution that does not require any technology transfers from Israel. A combination of 'Islamic science' and the vast financial reserves of the Arab oil states should have sufficed to equip Hamas with all that it needed to create its own Jew-proof Sharia Dome.

2) In addition to its defence capacity, the equally great superiority of its armed forces military is frequently invoked to criminalise Israel. It is an aggressor state, armed to the teeth with all the high-tech hardware of modern warfare, while Hamas, the innocent victim, has only tunnels, rockets, small arms...and suicide bomb vests. (This argument conveniently overlooks the massive combined military preponderance of the Arab states bordering on, or within striking distance of Israel, a force which, on three occasions, in 1948, 1967 and 1973, was deployed in attempts, as the Iranian Ayatollahs have it, to 'wipe Israel off the map'.) Since they have been made to loom so large in the case against Israel's conduct in the Gaza conflict, the validity of these criteria needs to be tested by placing them in their

broader historical context, even though some might object, as has been my personal experience, that they are only applicable when Jewish forces are involved in military conflicts.

During the Second World War, the Western Allies and the Axis powers inflicted heavy civilian casualties on each other, both as an unintended side effect of actions aimed at military targets, and also as a result of deliberate targeting of predominately residential areas. Starting in 1942, British Bomber Command's 'area' or 'strategic' bombing was designed to generate the utmost devastation, chaos, demoralisation and disruption in the enemy's densely populated locations, such as was achieved in the incendiary raids on Hamburg and Dresden. In the words of Air Marshal Arthur 'Bomber' Harris, 'The Nazis started this war with the rather childish delusion that they were going to bomb everyone else and nobody was going to bomb them. At Rotterdam, London, Warsaw and half a hundred other places, they put this rather naïve theory into operation. They sowed the wind, now they are going to reap the whirlwind.'

Many have found this statement, and what it led to, morally indefensible, I do not, though certain bombing raids, such as the incineration of Dresden in February 1945, which had no strategic purpose other than to please Stalin, undoubtedly were. Harris's pledge was in response to Nazi Germany's *Luftwaffe* 'Blitz', which had already adopted the same strategy in raids on London, Coventry and other cities, though on a far smaller scale than that subsequently achieved by the Western Allies against Germany. In the Far East, US bombers obliterated entire Japanese cities with the same strategy of area bombing.

The 'disproportionality' of Axis and Allied (that is to say, UK and USA) bombing can perhaps be best demonstrated by some simple statistics. In the whole of the war, Germany dropped 74,172 tons of bombs (including 'V' weapons) on the UK. In just *one month*, August 1944, the Allies dropped nearly twice that amount, to be precise, 137,864 tons, on Axis targets in Europe. In the entire war, the Allies dropped a total of 1,855,919 tons of bombs on Axis targets in Europe, *25 times* the Axis total. The overwhelming majority of the Allied targets were German cities, with their massive concentrations of civilians. Ensuing civilian deaths from bombing alone are estimated approximately as follows: USA, nil; UK, 60,000; Germany, 500,000; Japan, 500,000; Italy, 60,000; to which we should add 70,000 civilians of countries under Nazi occupation also killed, though obviously not intentionally, by Allied bombing raids. This gives a combined total of Axis civilian deaths by bombing of around one million; that of the UK and the USA, who did the bombing, 60,000. This would appear 'disproportionate' in the extreme and, what is more, not so different from the ratios claimed in Hamas-Israel conflicts. Consistency requires that those who use the criteria of 'disproportionality' to judge Israel to be the guilty party in its conflicts with Hamas should likewise invoke the same criteria to determine who was the innocent party in the Second World War. If they do not, then they need to explain why.

When Israel has retaliated against attacks on its civilian population, its armed forces have been charged with deliberately killing children, hence the accusation that Jews are 'baby killers'. (The facts establishing who were the real, deliberate, baby killers are provided below.) Strategic or 'area' bombing in the Second World War was certainly intended not only to cause damage to military, infrastructural and industrial facilities, but also to cause the maximum possible disruption to civilian life and, by so doing, undermine its role in the war effort. But there is no evidence

that those who devised this strategy deliberately set out to kill children, whose death, unlike possibly those of their parents, would have had absolutely no impact on the outcome of the war. 'Baby killing' was an unintended but, given the nature of strategic bombing, inevitable result of Allied and Nazi aerial warfare. Assuming, reasonably, that the ratio of adult to child deaths caused by bombing was roughly the same on both sides, it follows from the enormous disproportion in the civilian deaths caused by bombing (a ratio of 16 to one) that the Western Allies killed by bombing something like 16 times more children than the Axis powers. Yet, apart from the Third Reich's various propaganda agencies, no-one so far as I am aware accused the Western Allies of being deliberate 'baby killers' any more than has been Hamas by its supporters when its suicide attacks and firing of rockets have caused the deaths of Jewish children, including babies. So why then are the armed forces of Israel accused of this war crime? I submit that it is not because of their bombing tactics, but because they are Jews.

Horrendous statistics such as those above have persuaded some commentators on the Second World War, arguing on similar grounds to those who criticise Israel for its 'disproportionate' response to terrorist attacks and invasions, that the Allies' bombing strategy was morally indefensible, a case that though flawed, needs to be taken seriously. Others have added to this charge the claim that it was a waste of resources. But only pacifists, and those whose Nazi sympathies colour their judgement of the issues, use the first objection to arrive at the conclusion that the Allied cause was thereby morally fatally flawed. Yes, the Allies were, knowingly, killing babies. But not deliberately. There is difference. And it is an important one. All manner of human actions have secondary, unintended but known effects. Every time someone drives a fossil fuel powered vehicle, they are, probably knowingly, contributing to global warming and air pollution, both with fatal consequences. But that is not the intention, which is to get from A to B.

As in other situations where choices between different courses of action are possible, faced with the challenge of the Axis powers, there was of course the option of doing nothing, as indeed pacifists and appeasers demanded, just as in 2003 the far left opposed the removal of the genocidal Saddam regime, and more recently, any military actions against the Islamic State, with the sanctimonious slogan 'not in my name', and more recently again, likewise opposed Western military supplies to Ukraine after its invasion by Russia, as did Corbyn and his 'Stop the War Coalition'. Yet, as in the Second World War, doing nothing would have resulted in the toleration of or allowing to happen greater evils than those caused by doing what was necessary to combat them. There were politicians who thought in 1939 (and historians who do even today) that Britain did not need to and therefore should not have declared war on Nazi Germany when Hitler invaded Poland on September 1, 1939. But it did, and from this decision, much followed, including the killing of babies by Allied bombing. But their deaths were the unintended tragic consequence of a war fought against an enemy that amongst its many other crimes, was killing babies, together with their parents, on an industrial scale vastly in excess of the death toll of Allied bombing, not as the unintended by-product of a war, *but deliberately, simply because they were Jews.*

Can the conduct and outcome of the Second World War help to throw light on issues raised in the course of the series of Israel-Hamas wars that began in 2014? As I said, I have been told, as it so happens, by a vehement opponent of Israel, that it cannot, though without being given any reason as to why. Nevertheless I had

the impression that wars involving Jews should be judged by different criteria than those that do not. Even so, echoing 'Bomber' Harris, we can say, with complete justice and accuracy, the following: 'On October 7, 2023, Hamas launched its fifth, yes, *fifth* unprovoked attack on Israel since 2008, assuming that as on all previous occasions, the Jews were not going to fight a full scale war in reply. They put their rather naïve theory into operation, and discovered that having sowed the wind, they were to reap a whirlwind.'

Leaving aside those on the left and in the Arab world who quote openly desire and seek the elimination of Israel as a Jewish state, let us consider the most often cited objection to Israel's military response to Hamas attacks, that of the disproportion of the force used. And yes, here the Second World War is indeed a guide to establishing the issues at stake. We have already measured the relative scales of aerial warfare. As to relative military strengths between the Axis and Western Allies, in terms of industrial capacity, men under arms, population reserves, access to food and raw materials (especially fuel) and the quality and quantity of war material, the superiority of the Allies was enormous, rendering the ultimate defeat of the Axis powers inevitable. Yet, if, at the war's end in 1945, the two criteria, disproportions of civilian casualties and military capacity deployed, which are used today to condemn Israel, had been adopted to judge which of the warring powers had justice on its side, then, surveying the heaps of domestic rubble and piles of charred and mangled civilian corpses strewn across a Germany and Japan crushed by vastly superior forces, there could have been only one conclusion. Purely on the basis of which side has suffered the most civilian casualties, Hitler's Reich would have been declared the innocent victim of war crimes, and the Western Allies, war criminals for inflicting them. Since their argument is a moral one, those who have claimed this in the past, and those who still do now, were and are nevertheless obliged to consider what would have ensued for civilisation and the future of mankind if the Allies, for fear of being accused of war crimes by deploying 'disproportionate' force against the Nazis, as indeed they did, had refrained from taking the actions necessary to defeat them and, as a consequence of such scruples, lost the war.

It is undeniably the case that some of the tactics adopted by the western allies in the war against the Axis powers would today be condemned as war crimes, ironically by the very body that owes its existence to the Allied war against and defeat of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Imperial Japan. But even one of the sternest critics of Allied 'strategic bombing', the philosopher A. C. Grayling, nevertheless has concluded that the greatest crime the Allies could have committed, but thankfully did not, *was to lose the war* or, I would add, choose not to fight it in the first place. Likewise, the greatest crime we in the west are capable of committing, and which the Sharia left and their Muslims allies wish us to commit, is to compound the West's betrayal of the Jews in the Second World War by allowing Israel to be militarily defeated and its Jewish population exterminated by the forces of Jihadi Islam. Such a betrayal would constitute nothing less than the capitulation of the civilisation of the 21st century West to a barbarism born of the seventh century East.

In his novel *Doctor Faustus*, Thomas Mann, a titan of not only German but world literature, dwelt at length on the ethical issues raised by the Second World, and in doing so, those of all military conflicts. As a political thinker, after a decade or more of internal intellectual and moral turmoil, Mann found his way from a

reactionary romantic German nationalism to a socialist humanism that, in exile after 1933, enabled him to become the most eloquent voice of the other Germany so dear to him. A crucial stage in this transition is captured in his masterly but morally ambiguous *The Magic Mountain*., begun in 1912 but completed, after many revisions, in 1924. With his *Doctor Faustus* written in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, this progression is consummated. Written in the form of a series of episodes in the life of the (fictitious) modernist composer Adrian Leverkühn, the story is told by his life-long friend Serenus Zeitbolm. With the composer now dead, and the Third Reich approaching its end, through his narrator Mann strikes the moral balance of the war in one of the most passionate and moving passages he ever wrote. Mercilessly bombarded from the air and besieged by armies that daily tighten the circle around the Reich, Zeitbolm, German patriot to the core, accepts not only the inevitability but the justice of his country's defeat and even, if necessary, its annihilation. Recalling the symbolic tragic last days of his friend's tormented life, he describes and reflects on the last paroxysms of Hitler's Reich:

...the terrors of almost daily raids upon our beleaguered Fortress Europa grow into incredible dimensions. Thousands [of bombers] darken the skies of our fiercely united continent, and ever more of our cities fall in ruins...It is all up with Germany, it will be all up for her. She is marked down for collapse, economic, political, moral, spiritual, in short, all embracing, unparalleled, final collapse...I suppose I have not wished for it, because my pity is too deep, my grief and sympathy are with this unhappy nation...My heart contracts painfully at the thought of that enormous investment of faith, zeal, lofty historic emotion; all this we made, all this is now puffed away in a bankruptcy without compare. No surely I don't want it, and yet - I have been driven to want it, I wish for it today and welcome it, out of hatred for the outrageous contempt of reason, the vicious violation of the truth, the cheap, filthy backstairs mythology, the criminal degradation and confusion of standards; the abuse, corruption, and blackmail of all that was good, genuine and trusting, and trustworthy in our old Germany.

We can sure that this is Mann speaking for himself, for he too, loathing the Nazi regime as he did as the incarnation of evil, desired its defeat, as the saying goes, by any means necessary, irrespective of body counts or 'disproportionate responses'. As the Allied air forces delivered their deadly cargoes on his beloved homeland, Mann was addressing his fellow Germans on the evils of the Hitler regime, and the necessity for its destruction, in broadcasts transmitted by the BBC's long and medium wave services. The composer Richard Strauss, unlike Mann, initially allowed his international reputation to be exploited by the Nazi regime. But at the war's end, though like Mann, he mourned the devastation visited on Germany's architectural treasures, he also, like Mann, believed it was a price that had to be paid to put an end to 'the most terrible period of human history', a 'twelve-year reign of bestiality, ignorance and anti-culture under the greatest criminals in human history.'

If Strauss and Mann are right, (though of course pacifists and Nazis, for different reasons to be sure, would say they are not) then there is an alternative criterion to 'disproportionality' to determine the justness or otherwise of a cause pursued by military means. It is to simply ask, what would the world be like now, if, for fear of inflicting civilian casualties, the Allies had conducted the Second World War *a la*

Corbyn, in ways that guaranteed defeat? Likewise, it does not require a great effort of the imagination to picture what the fate of Israel's Jews would be if they likewise resisted Jihadi aggression by similar methods. Hamas and its kindred movements would complete the task that Hitler began and, if he had not been defeated on the seas, from the air and on the battlefield, would have completed himself. It is there in the Charters of Hamas and Hezbollah; in the far from empty threats of the Ayatollahs, it was there for all to see in the abattoirs of the ISIS 'caliphate' in Syria and Iraq. We would be witnesses to another Holocaust.

5 What Holocaust?

The most ill-founded and malicious of all the accusations brought against Israel is that its leaders, with either the acquiescence or active participation of its Jewish population, have either committed, are committing, or at the very least, intend to commit genocide against the Palestinians. The Cairo Declaration of December 2002, which Corbyn and Loach signed, says exactly this, not once, but twice. Why the Jews want to commit this worst of all crimes when they themselves have been its principal victims, is never explained. Is it perhaps an act of revenge or retribution? If so, why Palestinians and not Germans? Or maybe they do it just because they are Jews, out of sheer blood lust. Although those who make this accusation, who include not only Sharia leftists, but Neo-Nazis and Muslim leaders who deny Hitler's Holocaust of the Jews, never provide a motive for this crime, the purpose of the accusation is clear, at least so far as the far left is concerned. It is to liken the Jews of Israel to the Nazis. (See Appendix A) This comparison, an ever-present theme of anti-Zionism, also serves a purpose that in being so demonstrably, if perversely anti-Nazi, those making it cannot be accused of anti-Semitism. Having thus, as they believe, established their anti-racist credentials, the Sharia left can then feel free to vilify Israeli Jews as genocidists with impunity. This tactic, designed to appeal to liberal and leftist public opinion in the west, is also employed by anti-Semitic Palestinian organisations.

While the Hamas Covenant in Articles 17, 22 and 32 fishes out of the cesspit of Nazi doctrine all that it needs to legitimise its hatred of the Jews, Article 20 rails against the 'Nazism of the Jews', its authors' apparently oblivious to the absurdity of such contradictions. But note this: when on the many occasions the Jews are likened to Nazis by Muslims, rarely, if ever, will there be any reference to Hitler; for example, that in their treatment of the Palestinians, the Israelis are behaving as Hitler did to the Jews or, as a variant (also purveyed on the far left) that during the Second World War, the Zionist leaders collaborated with Hitler to kill off those Jews opposed to the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. Instead, it is always nameless Nazis who are responsible for an often radically downsized Holocaust, as it is the same nameless Nazis who do the deals with equally anonymous 'Zionist leaders', killing only anti-Zionist Jews, while leaving the rest to become colonisers of Palestine. (As a variant on this tactic, being one that served the same purpose, Livingstone claimed on more than one occasion that far from being an enemy of the Jews, Hitler was a 'supporter of Zionism', a lie that resulted in his being suspended - yes, only suspended - from the Labour Party, since this was under Corbyn. But on those occasions when Hitler's name is associated by Muslims with the Holocaust, we shall see that far from being blamed for it, he is praised. The reason for this is obvious, and it is one the Sharia left would much prefer not to be talked about: **Hitler is an Arab and Muslim hero.** Fully aware of the exalted status of the man who ordered and went two thirds of the way towards achieving the extermination of all Europe's Jews, the Sharia left has taken great care to follow the example set by the Jihadis and clerics who pull its strings. Zionists are Nazis to be sure, but never 'Hitlerites'. As Livingstone tells it, it was only when Hitler 'went mad' that he reversed his support for Zionism by setting in motion the extermination of the Jews.

There was nothing novel about the Hamas Charter's likening of Zionism to Nazism, or in some versions of the same tactic, to fascism. It was written into the PLO Charter adopted at its National Congress in Cairo in July 1968. Article 22 is explicit on this point: '[Zionism] is racist and fanatic in its nature, aggressive, expansionist and colonialist in its aims, and fascist in its methods'. In an interview in August 1969, the PLO Chairman Yasser Ararat went further. It was not just a question of Israel's fascist 'methods'. Israel itself was a 'racialist, fascist state'. So then, by extension, were all those Jews who approved of Israel's policies or even mere existence. *Al Fatah*, the dominant faction within the PLO, elaborated on these themes in the second of its Seven Points, adopted in January 1969, describing Israel as 'the expression of colonisation based on a theocratic [sic], racist and expansionist system of Zionism and colonialism'. (Corbynistas have adopted this terminology, calling Israel a 'racist, colonialist endeavour'.)

The end result has been that the terms fascist and Nazi have been entirely divested of their anti-Jewish connotations and original usage. They now serve as terms of abuse directed exclusively against Israel and its supporters in the Jewish diaspora. There was a time, back in the 1960s and '70s, when the left warned of the dangers of a revival of fascist movements, the neo, or new Nazis, as they were often called. In the UK, the Socialist Workers Party established (only to later abandon) the Anti-Nazi League to combat them. Then, only Nazis were Nazis. Today, the 'New Nazis' are Jews, the old ones either long forgotten, or their crimes, as we shall see, associated with Zionism.

This inane practice of indiscriminately labelling political opponents as fascist or Nazi has a pedigree that, for anyone on the left who uses it, should be a cause for considerable embarrassment. Unable to defeat their western democratic socialist rivals by conventional political methods, beginning in 1928, the leaders of the Moscow-based Communist International (the Comintern) on Stalin's instructions unleashed a world-wide campaign of slander and intimidation against the leaders and members of Social Democratic parties and trade unions who, like Israel today, were denounced as fascist, or more precisely, 'social fascist', both in their methods and policies. The by now ousted and exiled Leon Trotsky (who was also soon to be tarred in the Moscow Show Trials of the 1930s with the same brush) warned that this policy's only result would be the deepening of divisions within the working class, leading to the victory of the real fascists, as indeed happened in Germany in 1933.

Today, the Sharia left is comprised, in part, of organisations that trace their origins back to Trotsky's break with Stalin in the mid-1920s and his Fourth International, founded in 1938 to rival and eventually supplant the movement controlled from Moscow by Stalin. The older leaders among the far left know full well that what convinced Trotsky to embark on the launching of his new International was the refusal of the Comintern leadership to change the strategy that had led to Hitler's victory in Germany; that of refusing to form a united front against the Nazis with other left forces, on the grounds that they were 'social fascists'. (The UK far left referred in similar spirit and with equal venom to Corbyn's Labour Party opponents as 'Blairite scum', while no such invective was directed against the right. Tory leaders were still just Tories.) They will also know that Stalin, the architect of the policy that smoothed Hitler's rise to power, six years later concluded his pact with the all too real fascists of the Third Reich, by so doing, enabling the *Wehrmacht* to unleash the onslaught on Poland that began the Second World War.

But knowing history does not automatically lead to learning from it. In its promotion of anti-Semitic Jihadism and, through its network of front organisations, of an unrelenting campaign of slandering the Jews of Israel as racists and Nazis, the Sharia left reproduces, admittedly in a very different historical setting, and, thankfully on a far smaller scale, the same criminal stupidities that made possible the victory of the real Nazis in Germany. The proof of the effectiveness of these tactics is that anyone objecting to this mindless name-calling or challenging the anti-Zionist left's venomous hostility towards Israel or the Jews, can easily find themselves, *ipso facto*, being accused of Islamophobia, racism and even of harbouring Nazi sympathies.

Who would have thought, back in the heyday of the left of the 1960s, there would come a time when resistance to anti-Semitism would be branded as Nazism, and that by subverting the original, and historically specific usage of the term Nazi, the real Nazi genocide would be virtually erased from history, to be replaced by a mythical Jewish genocide of the Palestinians? The reader might find this hard to credit, but the truth is, the far left has even concocted its own version of Holocaust denial. In August 2008, a leaflet issued in the name of the Socialist Workers Party at a counter-demonstration to a British National Party rally at Derby, gave the following description of the Nazi Holocaust, in which '1000s of LGBT [lesbians, gays, bi-sexuals, transvestites], trade unionists and disabled were slaughtered.' *But not six million Jews*. And no gypsies either. Some might argue, in the SWP's defence, that this Jewless Holocaust was simply an oversight, as in fact the SWP General Secretary Martin Smith subsequently claimed. or, as someone naively suggested to me, that the extermination of the Jews was so well-known it could be taken for granted. (In which case, why the need for a leaflet?) However, neither excuse, nor indeed any other that could be made, can account for the inclusion on the list of those who did not share the fate of the Jews. And they do not explain why those responsible for the leaflet's printing and distribution, all, like Smith, dedicated anti-Nazis, also failed to notice the omission. Would the SWP have accepted a similar excuse for a Stalinist account of the Russian Revolution that made no reference to the role of Leon Trotsky? We shall see that this shameful episode was far from being a 'one off', because the omission of the Jews and/or the inclusion of those who were not Holocaust victims by the far left subsequently occurred on at least *seven* more occasions, one being by Corbyn during speech in the House of Commons. (see below)

But even if Jews had been added to the list, the number 'slaughtered' would still only have been reckoned in 'thousands' instead of (six) millions. And unlike the Jews, who were not listed, none of the categories that were listed was marked down for total elimination. And again, unlike the Jews, insofar as members of these categories were victims of Nazi persecution, they met their ends in concentration camps in Germany, not death camps in Poland. Former members of Germany's once powerful but from May 2, 1933, outlawed trade union movement certainly did die in concentration camps, as did former members of banned left wing workers' parties, the Social Democrats ('social fascists' to the Stalinists) and the Communists. Gay men also died in the camps, though writing in the *Gay History and Literature* website, Rictor Norton accepts that 'no-one knows how many'. However, the number certainly runs into the thousands. As for lesbians, according to *Gay Star News*, 'researchers have discovered only a few cases of women who were sent to concentration camps because of their sexuality'. The Trans website *Quora* comes to

similar conclusions about the treatment of transgenders in the Third Reich: 'Due to extreme gender roles, most trans men and cis lesbian women were not considered a threat to the Aryan race because they could still bear children for Germany...Few trans men and cis lesbians were sent to camps on the sole basis of their identity...' Again, not slaughtered in their thousands. As for the disabled, it is not clear if this term is intended to refer only to the mentally handicapped and those suffering from various hereditary diseases, who were put to death in their tens of thousands, or also to those who were physically 'disabled' by accident or war injury, who were not.

Precisely this same Jewless Holocaust was again revisited when the far left-dominated University and College Union emailed its branches, encouraging them to observe Holocaust Memorial Day on January 27, 2020. The email provided a list numbering 15 categories of people whom it said were victims, in every case bar one, that of gypsies, again wrongly, of the Nazi Holocaust: trade unionists, communists, social democrats, Roma and Sinti, blacks, disabled, freemasons, gays and lesbians, Jehovah Witnesses, pacifists, drug addicts, beggars, alcoholics, prostitutes and 'non-Jewish [sic] Poles'...but again, incredibly, *no Jews*, Polish or otherwise. The omission, rendered all the more glaring by the inclusion of specifically '*non-Jewish Poles*', since the Nazis murdered three million *Jewish Poles*, was put down a 'drafting error', one that once again, no one involved in the circular's production noticed. In view of this omission, should we be surprised that the Union officially supported BDS, and rejected the International Definition of Anti-Semitism that Corbynista Labour Party National Executive Committee members also opposed, instead, again like Corbyn, choosing one that would permit the likening of Israel to Nazi Germany?

On Holocaust Memorial Day, January 27, 2023, in Jerusalem, a Palestinian terrorist chose that day to gun down seven Jews outside a synagogue, like previous such massacres, one celebrated, according to Palestinian media, by the distribution of sweets to children. Also that same day, in Cardiff, Corbynista Julie Morgan, Welsh Assembly Deputy Minister for Social Services, issued to Assembly members and workers an email commemorating the Holocaust. She listed as its victims 'Gypsies, Roma and travellers [sic] – remembering all' – '*all that is, except the Jews*'. Back in London a matter of days later, following another terrorist attack in Jerusalem that wounded two Jews, another Corbynista, Labour MP Kim Johnson, rose in the House at Prime Minister's Question Time, not to condemn the Jerusalem killings and woundings, but to denounce the Israeli government as 'fascist', and to describe Israel as an 'apartheid' country.

We can perhaps put these inclusions of non-victims of the Holocaust, as we can the likening Israel to a fascist, apartheid state, down to an abysmal ignorance of history, of what constitutes fascism and apartheid. But surely not the exclusion of the Jews from victims of the Holocaust. This happens, not due to ignorance of history, but because Sharia leftists really do have a problem with the Holocaust. The problem is, its true history casts the Jews exclusively in the role of victims, which does not accord with the prevailing anti-Zionist narrative of the Jews as fascists, Nazis, racists, colonists, oppressors etc. Hence the repeated attempts to either deJudaify the Holocaust or, as we shall see, blame it on the Jews themselves, specifically, those Jews who were Zionists. For the same reason, Corbyn chose Holocaust Memorial Day in 2011 to support a motion in the House of Common to abolish the Day and to it replace it with a 'Genocide Memorial Day', on the irrelevant grounds that 'every life is valuable' and the lie that not only Jews

were victims of the Holocaust. (I suspect that had they been aware of it, his support for this proposal would have met with the approval of his Hamas 'friends', who not only deny the Holocaust took place, but in Article Seven of their Covenant, vow to commit one of their own.) Once again, Corbyn provided the same spurious listing of those who were not Holocaust victims that frequented Corbynista web-sites: 'working class activists, trade unionists, Jehovah's Witnesses, lesbian, gay and bi-sexual people.' As I have already said, eight years previously, on December 19, 2002 to be precise, by appending his name to a 'Cairo Declaration' that twice in its text, accused Israel of exterminating the Palestinians, Corbyn had given a very clear indication of the kind of genocides he had in mind. It would be not accurate to say that for Corbyn, lying about the Jews was his second nature, because it was his first.

When it comes to real and not fictitious genocides, from its very inception, Islam has been synonymous with well-authenticated slaughters on the grandest of scales, both in pursuit of conquest, plunder and conversion, and in the assassinations and blood purges amongst its own in the clan, tribal, ethnic, territorial and dynastic feuds that erupted after the death of its founder in 632 and have continued with scant respite to this day. Those who have recorded and even witnessed this catalogue of carnage tell their stories without any shame or embarrassment. Quite the contrary. (See Appendix L) That is not, however, how Islam and its apologists choose to depict the faith today, at least, not in the West. There, it assumes the pose of a peaceful victim of racism and un or ill-defined Islamophobia, in need of special favours and legal protection from those who would misrepresent its principles and aims, which are entirely peaceful. What is being demanded is already the law in officially secular Turkey where, a century and more after the event, it cannot be taught or even mentioned without risk of prosecution that as many as one and a half million Christian Armenians were murdered by the Islamic Ottoman Empire in 1915. To avoid any diplomatic unpleasantness, a number of western governments pretend to believe the official Turkish version, which refers to what it calls 'merely a replacement [of Armenians] within the Empire for security reasons'. (The Nazis, whom Turkish Islamic politicians now openly praise, also talked in similar fashion about the 'resettlement' of the Jews.)

Armenians were not the only victims of Ottoman genocide. Leaving aside the occasional local massacre, the following large-scale slaughters have been recorded:

1894-6: Between 100-300 thousand Armenians and Assyrians;

1914: Between 500-900 thousand Greeks;

1915: Between 270-750 thousand Assyrians.

Neither has Muslim blood lust been confined to Turkey. In December 1970, in Pakistan's first free election since the Islamic state's creation in 1947, the Bengalis of what was then East Pakistan voted so overwhelmingly for the autonomist policies of the Awami League, that the party won a majority not only in the East, but the whole country, thus entitling it to form a government. The West Pakistan, principally Punjabi, elite had, since the state's formation, treated the majority Bengalis in the east as second-class citizens, subjecting them to horrific economic exploitation, deeming them 'impure' Muslims, and forcing on them the alien Urdu language. A Pakistani general described them in racist terms as a 'low-lying people' living in a low-lying land. The governing class in West Pakistan responded to the

election result by refusing to accept the Awami League victory and launching a ferocious war of repression under the leadership of General Yahya Khan. Fanatical Islamic militias linked to the Jamaat-e-Islami Party, namely the Razakars, Al-Badr and Al-Shams, were unleashed on a defenceless civilian population. Politicians and intellectuals were rounded up and killed by the hundred. 200,000 women were raped and thousands more forced into army and Islamic militia brothels. United States officials in Pakistan, whose government under President Nixon, together with Chairman Mao in China, for geo-political reasons supported the repression, reported to Washington that a 'selective genocide' was under way, on a scale that to this day, has proved impossible to calculate with any accuracy. We do know that at least 10 million refugees from the slaughter escaped over the border into India. The religious dimension to the repression was all too evident in the targeting of East Pakistan's non-Muslim minorities, its Hindus and Biharis, though Muslims, being far more numerous, suffered the most casualties. Need one doubt that that the 'selective genocide' of the Bangladeshis had the approval of the West Pakistan clerical establishment?

Then there was Indonesia. Following its liberation from Japanese occupation at the end of the Second World War, the densely populated and overwhelmingly Muslim archipelago had developed a powerful labour movement under the leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party. An ultra-right back lash ensued, culminating in a CIA-backed military coup in October 1965, followed by a blood bath of leftists, trade unionists and non-Muslims, its victims numbering, at the very least, a staggering one million. 80,000 leftists, mainly Hindus, were massacred on the tiny island of Bali alone. Here too, the Islamic clergy played an invaluable role, instigating and even organising the mass slaughter of communists and labour leaders, workers and peasants. Two Islamic militias, Ansar, linked to Indonesia's largest Muslim organisation, Nahdlatul Ulama, and that of the smaller Muhammadiyah movement, were given *carte blanche* by the military to exterminate anyone they chose. The result was truly horrendous. Just as in Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan, Syria and Pakistan, in the name of their religion, Muslims killed fellow Muslims on an industrial scale. Truly the religion of peace and compassion, just as Obama said.

Looking back over the last century, one is struck by the fact that except for the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews (and even here, the Bosnian Muslim Waffen SS *Handschar* Division played its part), nearly all the genocides that have been so described were perpetrated by Muslims. More recently, we have the case of Sudan. Prior to the division of the county in 2011, Sudan had for decades experienced devastating ethnic and religious conflicts, always arising from attempts by the Arab and Islamic north to impose its will on the non-Arab and mainly Christian south. These conflicts escalated into all-out war after Khartoum's adoption of Sharia law in 1983, and the evolution of Sudan into a fully Islamic state two years later. The Islamisation of Sudan (who can ever forget the English school teacher sentenced to 40 lashes for allowing a teddy bear to be called Mohammed?) further intensified the *Jihad* against the south, and in the west, in the Darfur region, at the hands of the Janjaweed Muslim militia. Two million died and four million more were driven into exile. Then there was Uganda, where under the rule of the Hitler-loving Muslim dictator Idi Amin, in 1972, nearly all its (Hindu) Asian population were either murdered or driven into exile. Only his overthrow in 1979 frustrated Amin's intention to erect a statue of Hitler in Kampala.

More recently, with the attention of western media, politicians and anti-Zionist campaigners focused on the Palestinian issue and the alleged misdeeds of Israel, there has raged almost unnoticed and unprotested a ruthless religious cleansing of Christian minorities in Islamic states. This was not the beginning, but the acceleration and culmination of a process that had been under way for decades following the rise of Jihadi Islam. A century ago, Christians comprised 20% of the population of the Middle East. Today, with scarcely a protest from Christian leaders or coverage by western media, the percentage has fallen to five, and is still falling. The day cannot be far off when entire tracts of the Arab world will be able to declare themselves not only Jew but also Christian free. According to Open Doors, a body that monitors the persecution of Christians by Muslims, in 2014, the number of Christians being killed was averaging 322 *per day*. Yet there are Christian clerics who rather than speak out for their murdered brethren, choose instead to rail instead against an imaginary Israeli genocide of the Palestinians rather than a real one of Christians, even though they must, or if they do not, at least should know, that there is only one state in the Middle East where Christians are both safe and free to practice their religion as they wish. Is it necessary to say what that state is?

In the west, until the upsurge of Jihadi Islam, Holocaust revisionism had always been the preserve of the clinically insane, neo-Nazis, raving anti-Semites or the lunatic fringe of academe. But no longer. A part of the anti-Zionist left now sees the Holocaust, in so far as it features in their thinking at all, not as the greatest crime and tragedy in human history, with the Jews as its victims, but as an event that served and continues to serve the cause of Zionism, and therefore one that must in some way be 'de-judaified', even to the extent of accusing the Jews of complicity in their own murder. The kind of depraved thinking this led to was illustrated by a Livingstonian comment in the SWP's *Socialist Worker* of January 2007: 'The Zionists have certainly controlled the discourse about Holocaust Remembrance for many years, and have aggressively quashed the truth about *Zionist collaboration with the Nazis*'. (Emphasis added) SWP Chairman Mick Napier went further: 'The Holocaust Commemoration was used to justify the mass murder and expropriation of the Palestinians. An accurate [sic] understanding of the Nazi Holocaust is [therefore] essential to grasp modern Israeli savagery towards the Palestinian people'. This 'accurate understanding' re-cast the role of the Jews as collaborators with the Nazis, not their victims, and as the 'mass murderers' of Palestinians. This is the 'truth' that had been concealed by the Zionists (another Jewish conspiracy no less) but had been exposed by the anti-Zionist zealots of the SWP. Napier was saying that the Holocaust must be shown to have been at least in part a *Jewish* crime from the very beginning, a plot to promote the Zionist cause. For many on the far left, this has become the default position. The Holocaust only has significance in so far as it can be deployed to explain and expose not Nazi, but *Jewish* 'savagery', savagery towards the Palestinians. And as it uncovered and developed this long-suppressed 'accurate understanding' of the Holocaust, it was silent about the Muslim cleric who did collaborate with the Third Reich in the Holocaust of the Jews, and hoped to implement his own in the Middle East had the Nazis won the war...the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini. (See Chapter 6)

This Stalinist-style re-writing of the history of the Holocaust by the *dhimmi* left proceeded strictly according to the axiom enunciated by Orwell's Ministry of Truth, that 'he who controls the past controls the future'. The need to manufacture

a fictitious past is common to all totalitarian movements and regimes, and was captured perfectly by a now-fallen hero of the Sharia left. In a speech to Iraqi history teachers, Saddam Hussein defined what he called 'the Ba'athist way of writing Arab history' as one with 'an emphasis on analysis and not realistic [sic] story telling'. History was to be invented according to the needs of the hour, as defined by the infallible Leader, not discovered and related by historians. In a like spirit, Muslims and Sharia leftists have each set about re-writing the history of the Holocaust with the sole object of replacing the 'realistic story', that is, the truth, with an 'analysis' that re-casts it as an event (in so far as it happened at all) that was in the first place at least partly facilitated by Jews and then subsequently exploited by Jews to create and legitimise the state of Israel.

In his dual role as President of the Muslim Council of Britain and Vice President of the Stop the War Coalition, Anas al-Tikriti naturally agreed with this anti-Zionist re-evaluation of Holocaust Memorial Day. It had 'become a political event [sic] which 'glorified the state of Israel'. So the Holocaust was not a political event? Al-Tikriti (who has close links with the theocratic Muslim Brotherhood and its Hamas offshoot) like Corbyn wanted to rebrand the event as a (de-Zionised) 'Genocide Memorial Day', and to shift the focus away from the Holocaust of the Jews onto the 'immeasurable suffering of the Palestinians at the hands of Israelis every single day'. This, of course, was not political. Given that Holocaust Memorial Day was 'controlled' (like everything else) by the Zionists (for Zionists read Jews), it naturally followed that measures had to be taken to discredit it. Such indeed was the stance adopted by the Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign. To this end, in 2007, the SPSC organised explicit counter-Holocaust Memorial Day events in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Dundee, which had nothing to say about the Nazi extermination of the Jews, but instead focused on the claim that 'open, ethnic cleansers now occupy senior positions in the nuclear-armed Israeli government'. In a statement promoting its week of Zionist-baiting, the SPSC complained that

Increasingly, Holocaust Commemoration has become a travesty, devoid of any moral compass that condemns today's mass killing of brown-skinned people for oil or strategic goals. Holocaust Commemoration has been embraced by our government, currently engaged in the genocidal [sic] occupation of Iraq, and Zionists who defend Israel's ethnic cleansing [sic] of Palestine. The Israeli Declaration of Independence claims the Holocaust as a justification for this Apartheid [sic] state.

If by 'Palestine' is also meant Israel, then far from Palestinians being 'cleansed', their proportion of the Israeli population has for decades been rising and now stands at 20% compared to 12% in 1950. Their current growth rate is double that of Israeli Jews. Some genocide. Neither have any Palestinians been expelled from the Gaza Strip, or the West Bank, where their populations are also on the rise, *faster in fact than in any Arab state*. However, ethnic cleansing of the Jews from Israel is the stated goal of Hamas and Hezbollah.

Rounding off these events were readings from the play *Perdition* by Jim Allen, a former leading member of Gerry Healy's Socialist Labour League (later the Saddam and Gaddafi-funded Workers Revolutionary Party) and directed by Ken Loach, a one-time WRP sympathiser, and then convert to Corbynism, who has declared his support for a debate on the left as to whether the Holocaust did indeed happen. The message of the play, one we will repeatedly encounter from Muslim

preachers and politicians and recycled by their Sharia left stooges, is that the Holocaust was a joint enterprise on the part of the Nazis and Jewish leaders to further the ends of Zionism. In the words of its author, it was 'the most lethal [sic] attack on Zionism ever written because it touches at the heart of the most abiding myth [sic!!!!] of modern history, the Holocaust. Because it says quite plainly that privileged Jewish leaders *collaborated in the extermination of their own kind* [sic] *in order to help bring about a Zionist state, Israel, a state that is itself racist.*' (Emphasis added) Loach claimed that an 'organized Zionist lobby' (for which read 'Jewish') had prevented the staging of the play at London's Royal Court Theatre. That the play had been proven by Martin Gilbert, an eminent specialist historian of the period and subject, to contain no fewer than 60 historical falsifications, was evidently no impediment to its enlistment in the campaign to incite the maximum possible hatred against the Jews of Israel on, of all occasions, Holocaust Memorial Day. That is what 'understanding' the Holocaust was really about. Not the Nazi 'mass murder' of and 'savagery' towards the Jews, but Zionist collusion in the Holocaust, and Jewish 'mass murder' of and 'savagery' towards the Palestinians. Here we had, fully developed, the 'left' version of Holocaust revisionism. That is, until post-modernist historians and critical race theorists took a hand in the proceedings.

As an example of the latter, in 2022, a debate developed on the woke/BLM left in response to the claim that Anne Frank, despite being murdered in a Nazi gas chamber, had benefited from 'white privilege', as had, by the same token, all other Jews who had suffered the same fate. Here are two on-line comments that captured the flavour and intellectual level of the discussion:

'Anne Frank had white privilege. Bad things [sic] happen to people with white privilege also but don't tell the whites that',

'Yes, all [sic] white people are safe. No one is saying the Nazis didn't target white people, just that white people can hide behind their whiteness [even in a gas chamber], whereas in Nazi [sic!!!] USA black people can't. [presumably then not even Obama in the White House.] Go tell black people the whites got it hard'.

It would appear that staff of the Anne Frank Trust were not immune from the same woke contagion, because they invited of all people the poet and anti-Israel activist Nasima Begum, a former Media Officer for the Hamas-linked Muslim Council of Britain, to conduct a 'story-telling [sic] workshop' for young Trust ambassadors. Among her anti-Semitic postings which, in addition to her c.v., the Trust subsequently, after protests, admitted they should have checked out, was one that supported Hamas firing rockets into Israeli territory, because 'exiling a people from their own land justifies anything. [sic!] It's the Holocaust all over again except this time it's innocent Palestinians and ironically the perpetrators are you Zionist scum.' Another of her tweets read: 'What's sad [sic] is that the Jewish population faced genocide themselves in Hitler's Germany but they've implemented the same on Palestine for years', and yet another, 'You will always remain an illegal state. Death to you Zionist scum.' This is an unambiguous call for the genocide of seven million Jews. I wonder what 'stories' she told her charges. Another speaker at the same event was Suhanaiymah Manzoor-Khan, a leading activist in the Nejma Collective, a 'UK-based collective of Muslim volunteers working in solidarity with people in

prison [sic – that is, convicted Palestinian terrorists] by sharing resources and mutual support motivated by Islamic justice.’ This ‘justice’ included, in her own words, the ‘abolition’ of the ‘catastrophe’ of the state of Israel, one guilty of ‘genocidal violence’. She had tweeted that ‘Palestine matters for all of us [who were this “us”?] because we are witnessing genocide’. The Trust’s Director of Education, who organised the event and invited its speakers, was Corbyn enthusiast Sarah Nazum, which in all probability explained her preference for anti-Israeli Muslims, because she appointed another one, Shaista Aziz, as the Trust’s ‘Assistant Director for Youth Empowerment’. Beyond any doubt, the Anne Frank Trust was being Islamised, and, as a consequence, weaned away from its original purpose, which was to combat anti-Semitism in all its guises and manifestation, including the religious, and converted instead into a propaganda vehicle for Muslim anti-Zionists. Of its full-time staff of 34, only ‘9%’ were said to be Jews, in other words, three. Although established in 1991 to campaign exclusively against anti-Semitism, the Trust’s management said it was ‘particularly keen to address anti-black racism as a priority’. As we shall see, Black Lives Matter is not only anti-Israel, but like the Trust’s Muslim staff, anti-Semitic.

For reasons that should be obvious, western anti-Zionist activists cannot, unlike their Middle Eastern allies and Neo-Nazis, transform themselves into fully-blown Holocaust deniers. They are stuck with the Holocaust, much as they would like to wish it away. But we have already seen, it can still be harnessed to the cause of anti-Zionism. As with the Trust and the Scottish PSC, it has been subjected to a new, ‘relevant’, contemporary interpretation that while not denying it happened (but never so much as alluding to those many Muslims that do, or at the time, played an active part in it) places the Holocaust exclusively in a Palestinian context, as a crime exploited and even approved and facilitated by Zionists to justify the creation and then existence of Israel. This, the Sharia leftist account, is pitched to a largely infidel audience which, with few exceptions, accepts that the Holocaust really happened. As such, it runs alongside and complements the fully-blown denial version promoted by politicians, clerics and bogus academics of an Arab and more broadly, Muslim world that largely does not. On November 29, 2000, in one of his many appearances on Palestinian TV, ‘Professor’ I. Sissaleem gave viewers the benefit of his ‘accurate understanding’ of the Holocaust:

Lies surfaced about Jews being murdered here and there [sic] and the Holocaust. And of course, these are all unfounded claims. There was no Dachau, there was no Auschwitz! They were cleansing sites. They [the Jews] began to publicise in their propaganda media that they were persecuted, murdered and exterminated. Committees acted here and there to establish this entity [Israel], implanted as a cancer in our country. They always portrayed themselves as victims, and they made a centre [in Israel] for Heroism and Holocaust. Whose heroism? Whose Holocaust? It is our nation that is heroic. The Holocaust is against our people. We were the victims.

Had Professor Sissaleem perhaps been cribbing from the journal of the California-based Neo-Nazi Institute of Historical Review, the one that had promoted the anti-Zionist diatribes of Noam Chomsky? Because there, in an article dating from 1989 can be read the following: ‘The Holocaust is a religion. Its underpinnings in the realm of historical fact are non-existent - no Hitler order, no plan, no budget, no gas chambers, no autopsies [sic] of gassed victims, no ashes, no bones, no skulls, no

nothing.' All self-respecting anti-Zionists, whether they be members of the SWP or the Scottish PSC, activists of the Stop the War Coalition, or the anti-Zionist Muslim contingent at the Anne Frank Trust, would have endorsed the judgement of the journal's Neo-Nazi editor, Mark Weber, that the 'Holocaust Remembrance campaign deserves scorn, not support, because it is a one-sided effort that serves Jewish and Israeli interests and bolsters Jewish-Zionist power.' Naturally, Nick Griffin of the Neo-Nazi British National Party one of a number of maverick recruits to the Corbyn Appreciation Society (see Appendix T) agreed. He too dismissed the Holocaust as fiction and, just like the SWP and the SPSC, believed it was used to 'underpin the Zionist state'. Another Holocaust denier, the Nazi Ernst Zundel, in his *Open Letter to the Muslim World*, described the 'so-called Holocaust' as 'an extortion tool that yields Israel the money, power and excuse to occupy the Palestinians and to intimidate its neighbours'. Here is the point of convergence where neo-Nazis, Holocaust revisionists, Islamic Jihadis, anti-Semitic Muslims posing as scholars and the Sharia left meet: All claim, whether it is fact or fabricated, that the Holocaust and its remembrance are exploited by Jews to serve the ends of Zionism and oppress and even exterminate the Palestinians.

Charting the path that led to the drawing together of these otherwise disparate forces was Noam Chomsky. A highly respected academic specialising in linguistics, a prominent free speech campaigner and vocal critic of US foreign policy and as a Jew, insulated from accusations that his visceral anti-Zionism could be motivated by anti-Semitism, he was ideally placed to build a bridge between the Holocaust deniers of the extreme right and the anti-Zionism of the far left. I say insulated. Yet Chomsky was not above attacking Jews as such, and not only those who lived in the state of Israel. In a reply to an article in the *New York Times* of March 1989 that was sympathetic towards, though not uncritical, of, the Israeli cause, in describing New York as a city with a 'huge Jewish population, a Jewish-run media [sic], a Jewish Mayor and Jewish domination [sic!] of cultural life', Chomsky regurgitated the anti-Semitic bile of early 1930s Nazis railing against what they claimed was the Jewish control of the Weimar Republic.

First it should be noted that aside from his purely academic works, Chomsky's writings displayed an obsessive pre-occupation with the Middle East and within that context, what he saw as the sinister role of US policy in the region. His special venom however was reserved for Israel, which he likened to Nazi Germany, a practice which today is *de rigueur* not only in the West Bank, but on the anti-Zionist left. A survey of Chomsky's political writings conducted by Professor Werner Cohn shows that while they are 'careful not to justify Hitler explicitly', 'they create the impression that the Nazis could not have been any worse than the "war criminals" of the United States and Israel. Moreover, and this is indeed curious, almost all the references to Nazis in his books turn out to be denunciations of Nazi-like behaviour on the part of the Israelis.' Equally indicative of his propensity to use the term Nazi in this highly idiosyncratic fashion is that while Chomsky was free with the word when describing the policies and actions of Israel, in all his voluminous writings on the politics of the Middle East, he never so much as alluded to the well-documented collaboration with the Nazis by numerous prominent Arab and Muslim leaders before and during the Second World War, in the first place the anti-Semitic demagogue Haj Amin al-Husseini, Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and pioneer of today's Arab League and Organisation of the Islamic Conference, or to the hundreds of wanted Nazi war criminals who after the defeat of the Third Reich, found a safe

haven and lucrative employment in Syria and Egypt, and of whom several converted to Islam. (See Chapter 6) Back in the 1970's Chomsky also pioneered another political tactic that is a commonplace on the Sharia left today, and of which the prime example and exponent was former Leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn: collaboration with anti-Zionist Holocaust deniers and Jewish conspiracy theorists. Beginning in the mid-1970s, the French academic and Neo-Nazi Robert Faurisson had become one of the most prominent activists in the campaign to deny the reality of the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews. His denial was unambiguous, as was his hostility towards the state of Israel:

The alleged Hitlerite gas chambers and the alleged genocide of the Jews form one and the same historical lie, which opened the way to a gigantic political-financial swindle, the principal beneficiaries of which are the State of Israel and international Zionism [sic], and the principal victims of which are the German people - but not its leaders - and the entire Palestinian people.

As we shall see, it is the second part of this statement, with its indictment of Israel, support for the Palestinians, and allusion to the activities of 'international Zionism', that became the motive for Chomsky's collaboration with Faurisson the neo-Nazi, as they have, albeit in a different context, for Corbyn in his associations with company no less unsavoury. Faurisson's writings on Holocaust denial included what he claimed was a refutation of the authenticity of *The Diary of Anne Frank*, and contributions to the already cited journal of the California-based Institute for Historical Review and the like-minded French anti-Semitic *Annales d'Histoire Revisioniste*. In 1983, Faurisson ran afoul of a law which in France, as in a number of other western countries, and in my opinion, since it violates the right to free speech, wrongly, criminalises Holocaust denial. Faurisson was convicted and fined for having declared that 'Hitler never ordered nor permitted that anyone [sic] be killed by reason of his race or religion.' In 1991, Faurisson was, again in my opinion, wrongly, dismissed from his post at the University of Lyon, on the grounds of his denial of the Holocaust, but not those of academic incompetence which, if he were a professor of modern history instead of literature, would have been entirely justified. In recognition of his services to and sacrifices on behalf of the cause, on February 2, 2012 the Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad gave Faurisson, (who along with fellow anti-Zionists Ken Livingstone, Jeremy Corbyn, James Thring and George Galloway, was a guest performer on Iran's Press TV) an award for his 'courage'.

Chomsky always insisted that his involvement with Faurisson was motivated purely by his concerns for academic freedom, though their collaboration began in 1979, four years before Faurisson's first conviction for Holocaust denial, and 12 before his dismissal. In that year, Chomsky signed a petition protesting against what it described as a 'vicious campaign of harassment, intimidation, slander and physical violence in a crude attempt to silence him'. All this may well have been true. But the petition went far beyond condemning 'the shameful campaign to silence him'. It also described Faurisson as a 'respected Professor' and referred to what it called Faurisson's 'findings', not researches or opinions, as if they had some academic legitimacy that others were trying to suppress. 'Respected'... but by whom? And for what? As for 'findings', the word conveys the meaning that something has been 'found' to be true, a fact, evidence, in this case, that the Holocaust is a Jewish

fiction. How does one 'find' what does not exist? Chomsky did not draw up this petition. Its author was the publisher Pierre Guillaume, like Faurisson an anti-Semitic Holocaust denier. Guillaume's publishing ventures included the already mentioned *Annales* and essays by Faurisson on the Holocaust and related themes.

The wording of the petition, with its reference to the 'respected' Faurisson's 'findings', makes it patently clear that its purpose was not only to defend Faurisson's right to academic freedom (a cause that has only interested Chomsky when western countries were involved) but to present Faurisson as a scholar whose only concern was the pursuit of the truth. Chomsky surely must have realised this. So all he needed to do was add a disclaimer stating that the validity or otherwise of Faurisson's 'findings' was irrelevant to the issue, which is the universally adopted stance of genuine civil libertarians in freedom of speech cases. But he did not. In fact, to publicly demonstrate his solidarity not only with Faurisson, but Guillaume, Chomsky chose the author of the petition to publish the French edition of his book, *The Political Economy of Human Rights*, even though a number of prestigious French publishers would have been only too willing to do so.

Faurisson was not the only anti-Semite to have his 'findings' promoted by Chomsky. In 1994, the Professor provided an endorsement of *Jewish History, Jewish Religion* by the notorious Jewish anti-Semite Israel Shihak. Amongst its slanders against the Jews were claims that Jewish children are taught to utter a curse when they pass a non-Jewish cemetery, and that pious Jews worship both god and Satan. So sinful have been and still are the Jews that Shihak even found it possible to justify the worst pre-Holocaust massacre of Jews, namely that by Ukrainian Cossacks in 1648-9, with its victims, many killed with unspeakable barbarity, running into the tens of thousands. This and other similar pogroms Shihak described as 'popular anti-Jewish manifestations', praising them as 'progressive'. Nothing daunted, Chomsky kindly provided a blurb for the book's cover: 'Shihak is an outstanding scholar, with remarkable insight and depth of knowledge. His work is informed and penetrating, a contribution of great value'. Given Chomsky's special concerns, it is not too difficult to see to what cause this 'contribution' had been made.

His next step in the Faurisson affair was to issue a public declaration in his defence, an act of solidarity which, because of Chomsky international standing, had become the talk of the French political class and *academe*. Here was a world-famous Professor of linguistics and leftist campaigner aligning himself with Neo-Nazis and Holocaust deniers. (As indeed has Corbyn.) Written in French and titled 'Some elementary comments concerning the right of free expression', it made the case, impeccably, for the right of everyone to free speech, including, as seemed relevant to the case in hand, fascists and anti-Semites. But then Chomsky made haste to add that this was not directly relevant, because Faurisson was neither, being of all things, 'a sort of [sic] apolitical liberal', though one who nevertheless 'apolitically' fulminated against Israel and 'international Zionism' and in the name of 'liberalism' defended Hitler from the charge of the genocide of the Jews. Since it raised not a few eyebrows, Chomsky subsequently expanded on this theme, stating that he could 'see no [sic] anti-Semitic implications in denial of the existence of gas chambers, or even denial of the Holocaust.' So it must be by sheer coincidence, one that challenges the laws of probability, that without exception, all those who deny the Holocaust just happen to be anti-Semites. Chomsky continued in the same vein: 'Nor would there be anti-Semitic implications, per se, in the claim

(whether one believes it took place or not) that the Holocaust is being exploited, viciously so, by apologists for Israeli repression and violence. I [therefore] see no hint [sic] of anti-Semitic implications in Faurisson's work.' (Here Chomsky shared common ground with the stance on the Holocaust later promoted by the Scottish PSC.) Holocaust denial ('per se') having been given a clean bill of health by the venerated Professor, the next step was to move on from the legitimate defence of academic freedom to political collaboration with Holocaust deniers in areas of mutual agreement, those where the question of denial did not arise, in the first place the campaign to expose 'Israeli repression and violence' against the Palestinians'. This is exactly what Chomsky went on to do with the likes of Faurisson and Guillaume, again, just as Corbyn did with Holocaust deniers such as Paul Eisen (See Chapter 14), the Rev. Stephen Seizer (See Appendix T) and officials of Hamas and Hezbollah.

Chomsky's services did not go unacknowledged, especially his understanding attitude in the delicate little matter of Holocaust denial, as the Neo-Nazi publisher of Chomsky's book, and author of the Open Letter, Robert Guillaume, made clear:

Each time that Chomsky has said that his opinions remain "diametrically opposed" to those of Faurisson, he has done so in terms that are absolutely incapable of hurting Faurisson; and he has always indicated, by a word or a phrase, that his "diametrically opposed" view was more a matter of opinion than of scientific knowledge.

How tactful of Chomsky. The reality or otherwise of the Holocaust was a merely a matter of 'opinion', not 'scientific knowledge'. And as such, certainly not something to fall out over when there were more pressing issues at stake, in the first place, as always, the good fight against Zionism. Here, Chomsky's services were invaluable, and just as important as Faurisson's 'findings':

Chomsky was involved in very taxing struggles...Dramatic events were taking place in the Middle East [but aren't they always?]. His own work - the exposure of American imperialism there, of the realities of Zionism and of the state of Israel - took on an immediate significance, something that could lead to practical results. How is this work less important than Faurisson's?

How indeed. The *Journal of Historical Review*, the house journal of the already-mentioned Institute of Historical Review based in California, home also to its cosmological analogue, the Flat Earth Society and schools which teach anti-racist maths, similarly valued Chomsky's 'work' in the anti-Zionist cause. Apart from its own publishing activities, the Society's *Review* advertised other items that would have been of special interest to its largely Neo-Nazi readership. Amongst those so listed were various offerings by Adolf Hitler, *Communism with the Mask off* by Josef Goebbels, *The International Jew* by Henry Ford, *The Zionist Connection* by Alfred Lilienthal, that perennial Nazi and Hamas urtext, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* and, together with four other items by the same author, an anti-Zionist tract, *The Fateful Triangle* by...yes, Professor Noam Chomsky. What an encounter...Hitler and his propaganda minister rubbing literary shoulders, albeit posthumously, but not by mere chance, with the Godfather of Sharia leftism. The IHR singled out Chomsky for special praise, an author who 'enlightens as no other writer on Israel, Zionism and American complicity'. Also advertised were two tape

recorded anti-Zionist speeches, again by Chomsky, described by the *Review* as 'devastating', an 'uninterrupted cannonade directed squarely at U.S. foreign policy with regard to Israel' and 'Israeli imperialism', their promotion being yet another example of Holocaust denial proving no obstacle to fruitful collaboration between the far left and right in other areas of mutual interest and agreement...again, just as it had not been for Corbyn.

Of the seven (yes, seven) Chomsky items advertised by the *Review*, the title that the its editors selected to recommend especially to its readers was, as one would expect, devoted to an indictment of all things Israeli. But what is especially interesting, in view of the Neo-Nazi political sympathies of the book's promoters, is that all twelve of its references to Hitler had no other purpose than to liken Zionism to Nazism. Here too, Chomsky was something of an innovator. The strategy Chomsky pioneered has now become standard practise by anti-Zionists right across the political spectrum because today, the traditional divisions of left and right no longer apply when Israel and the Jews are the target. Former Ku Klux Klan Grand Wizard David Duke, whose writings have been recommended and circulated by Green Party members, presented a paper to the Holocaust denial conference convened in Tehran in December 2006, claiming the gas chambers did not exist and that the Jews exploited a non-existent genocide to justify establishing a state 'on the occupied territory of Palestine'. In language indistinguishable from that of Chomsky and the UK Sharia left, Duke, who in 2015, heralded Corbyn's election as Labour Leader as a ray of sunshine, and in 2016 endorsed Donald Trump's Presidential election bid, has rated Israel as 'the number one terrorist state in the world', while an associate of his, the Jewish conspiracy theorist James Thring, who also attended the Tehran event and, like Corbyn *et al*, guested on Iran's Press TV, and addressed a meeting at Westminster convened by Corbyn, on his website described Israel as 'an illegal, criminal, psychopathic, belligerent, apartheid entity' guilty of 'embezzlement, common theft, corruption, ethnic cleansing, massacre, murder, killing women and children, false imprisonment and torture'. Again, the level of invective is identical to that employed by the anti-Zionist left. Thring was the author of *Peace with Iran* and headed his own campaigning outfit, 'Planning for Peace'. What could be more Corbynite? He also claimed 'Jewish elders' control the world's banking system as do a number of postings on pro-Corbyn websites.

Corbyn's Hezbollah 'friends' were no less at home at home in this company. Sheikh Hassan Nasserallah, the head of the Ayatollahs' proxy militia, did not mince words when it came to Holocaust denial: 'The Jews invented the legend of the Nazi atrocities', while Israel, echoing the description of the Jews in the *Koran*, was 'the state of the grandsons of apes and pigs'. Not only was Israel targeted for destruction, but all the world's Jews: 'If Jews all gather in Israel, it will save us the trouble of going after them worldwide.' This is the same terrorist movement whose representatives Jeremy Corbyn described as his 'friends', shared a platform with at a meeting in Westminster, and marched and shared platforms with at the annual London anti-Zionist 'Quds Day' event initiated by Ayatollah Khomeini in 1979. ('Quds' is Arabic for Jerusalem, which Muslims spuriously claim as their holy city, in addition to Mecca and Medina)

Although it is standard practice on the far left to describe Hezbollah as an anti-Zionist 'resistance movement', like its Iranian puppet master, its proclamations no less than its actions leave no room for any doubt that the declared objective is not 'resistance' to Israel but the state's elimination, as in the *New Hezbollah Manifesto*

of 2009, which anticipates 'the historic demise of the Zionist entity' and re-affirms Hezbollah's 'total refusal of any kind of compromise with the Zionist entity which is based on admitting its legitimate presence. This stance is predetermined and permanent, and is not set for any compromise, even if the whole world admits to "Israel".' Nevertheless, Corbyn praised this movement for its commitment to 'long term peace' and readiness to engage in 'dialogue' The question is...with whom? Jeremy, for sure. But with Israel?

Like its kindred, Hamas, Hezbollah is a fervent believer in the existence of a world Jewish conspiracy, hence the need for the Jews' global extermination. And like other Arab TV networks, Hezbollah's Al-Manar TV also features programmes promoting *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, an obsession that led to the channel being banned in France. None of this gave the least cause for concern on the part of its leftist admirers, or for Corbyn not to describe its representatives as his 'friends'. In fact, Holocaust denial or, at the very least, revisionism, is pretty much the default position in Islamic states, as it is with Jihadi movements and prominent individual Muslims, especially those in the Middle East. For example, after complaints about the anti-Semitic bias of history teaching in the Palestinian Authority, UNRWA, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency that funds Palestinian Authority educational programmes, was finally persuaded to request that the PA include the Holocaust in its history courses. But in doing so, just like the SWP leaflet, the syllabus that was finally taught, to the evident satisfaction of UNRWA, omitted any reference to the extermination of the Jews, a Hamlet without the Prince. On September 21, 2001 Hamas TV likewise referred to a 'so-called Holocaust', but again, not the one that reputable western historians would recognise.

What it called this 'so-called Holocaust', 'according to research texts and researchers', merely involved the killing of 'certain Jews' opposed to Zionism, a 'policy planned by the Jewish leaders'. Here the Nazis have vanished entirely from the scene of the action, and the 'so-called Holocaust' becomes an entirely Jewish crime 'planned by Jewish leaders' to eliminate any Jewish opposition to the creation of the state of Israel. The Hamas default position on the Holocaust, identical to that of Hezbollah, was proclaimed to the world when it issued a denunciation of a historians' conference on the Holocaust held in Stockholm in January 2000: 'This conference bears a clear Zionist goal aimed at forging history by hiding the truth about the so-called Holocaust, which is an alleged story with no [sic] basis...By these methods, the Jews of the world [sic] flout scientific methods of research whenever that research contradicts their racist interests.' Nine years on, Corbyn was describing Hamas, whom he had (unsuccessfully) invited to share a platform with himself and Hezbollah at an anti-Israel meeting at Westminster, as his 'friends', 'friends' who while denying Hitler's Holocaust of the Jews, in their Covenant, made no secret of their intention to carry out a Holocaust of their own. Inevitably, following his election as Labour Leader in 2015, Corbyn's declaration of friendship for the genocidists of Hamas came back to haunt him. But then his devotees might well reply that we are overlooking the 'bigger picture'. Why fall out over one off the cuff remark made years ago? It's the present that counts. And anyway, as the chant has, aren't we all Hamas now? Hamas co-founder, Abdul Aziz al Rantisi shared a similar cavalier attitude to the past, explaining what results could be obtained by deploying what he called the 'scientific method' in the Hamas weekly journal *Al-Risal* of August 21, 2003. 'It is no longer a secret that the Zionists were behind the Nazis' murder of many Jews and agreed to it, with the

aim of intimidating them to emigrate to Palestine. Every time they failed to persuade a group of Jews to emigrate they unhesitatingly sentenced them to death.' Such crimes as the Nazis had committed were a 'tiny particle compared to the Zionist terror against the Palestinian people.'

If this version of the Holocaust is true, and there might be other Muslims who, like al Rantisi, interest themselves in this question who believe that it is, then what western historians have been telling us for the last seventy years about the role of a certain Waffen SS officer, Dr Josef Mengele, in the alleged murder of one million Jews at Auschwitz is a pack of lies. In the orthodox *kuffar* version, one of Dr Mengele's responsibilities (another was medical experiments on Jewish twins) involved selecting for immediate gassing newly-arrived Jews who were judged too young, too old or unfit to work as slaves in the giant IG Farben industrial complex conveniently situated close to the death camp. According to eyewitness accounts (all by Jews, so who can trust their word?) Dr Mengele stood at the reception platform, and after a cursory inspection, it was either right to the slave camp, or left to the gas chamber. Now, thanks to the 'scientific' historical research conducted under the auspices of one of Jeremy Corbyn's 'friends', we know differently. Instead of a health or age check, it was a question asked by a polite SS officer: 'Are you a Zionist? Yes? Excellent. Take the first on the right to Palestine.' This is how history is taught by those whom the future leader of the Labour Party found it an 'honour' to describe as his 'friends', and for whom the murder of six million Jews by the Nazis was but a 'tiny particle'.

It is easy to see why, with both Hamas and Fatah having publicly advertised their official versions of the Holocaust, subsequent token attempts by UNRWA to persuade the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank and Hamas in the Gaza Strip to allow the correct teaching of the subject in its schools predictably met with a blanket refusal. However, this does not explain why, in the 222 Gaza schools (out of a total of 600) that came directly under the administration of UNRWA, the Holocaust was not taught there either. When reports went the rounds that UNRWA had plans to introduce the subject (but only in its own schools) a squad of outraged Hamas officials went on the offensive. One Hamas agency described the Holocaust as 'a lie made up by the Zionists', and another, the Interior Ministry, declared that 'we reject teaching our pupils such thoughts as contradict our Palestinian beliefs', a view of history akin to the Nazi concept of 'race truth'. Hamas cleric Yunis al-Astal likened teaching the Holocaust to 'marketing a lie', amounting to a 'war crime' no less. Another official on the inflated and western-funded Hamas payroll, Jamila al-Shanti, weighed in with a classic Orwellian 'the past is what we say it is': 'Talk about the Holocaust and the execution of the Jews contradicts and is against our culture, our traditions, values, principles, heritage and religion.' All of that may well be true. But so is the reality of the Holocaust.

Finally, we have the editor of the aptly named Hamas journal *Filastin*, Mustafa al-Sawwaf, who argued that teaching the Holocaust would 'harm our history [sic] and civilisation as well as our people's culture'. What kind of 'culture', and religion for that matter, is it that can be harmed by learning that the Nazis killed six million Jews? Remember, these were Comrade Corbyn's 'friends'. Faced with this onslaught, UNRWA obligingly caved in. It disowned and denied any intention of allowing the truth about the Holocaust to be taught in its schools, schools funded, it should be remembered, by whoever is reading these lines. Adnan Abu Hasna, the Palestinian (of course) UNRWA spokesman in Gaza, made haste to announce that

'such reports are totally untrue. The current curriculum that is taught to pupils at UNRWA schools does not contain any indication [sic...not even an 'indication'] of the subject of the Holocaust.' This is how children are educated in the Gaza Strip under a terrorist and anti-Semitic regime largely financed by the west and championed by the Sharia left and organisations claiming to represent the Islamic diaspora. But as we have seen, not just in Gaza. The PLO's version of Holocaust revisionism received its most public airing when Chairman Yasser Arafat addressed the United Nations General Assembly back in 1974. In the course of his vitriolic slandering of Israel, he could not resist the temptation to lecture delegates on a hitherto neglected aspect of Hitler's extermination of the Jews: 'While we [sic] were vociferously condemning the massacre of the Jews under Nazi rule, the Zionist leadership appeared more interested at that time in exploiting them as best it could to realise its goal of immigration into Palestine.' Again, the Holocaust is portrayed as in some way connected with a Zionist plot to settle Jews in Palestine. As we shall see in the next chapter, Arafat's 'we', and in first place his 'hero' and Hitler's *confidante*, the Grand Mufti al-Husseini, far from 'vociferously condemning the massacre of the Jews', was applauding and even actively collaborating with it. (See Chapter 6)

This rewriting of the history of the Holocaust, and the part played in it by Arab Muslims, has produced a version no less remote from the truth than the legends woven by Stalin's historians depicting his role as the architect and saviour of the Bolshevik revolution, and Trotsky as its arch traitor. Leading the revisionist pack in the 'moderate' West Bank, where teaching the true account of the Holocaust is also banned, was none other than Arafat's successor as Chairman of the Palestinian Authority, Mahmoud Abbas. In 1982, he was awarded a Doctorate by Moscow's Lumumba University in what can only be described as Holocaust Revision Studies, with a thesis titled, 'The Other Side', purporting to be an account of 'the secret relationship between the Nazis and the Zionists', also a favourite theme of Soviet historians no less than the Sharia left, and one no more related to reality than the fictions also once taught in Soviet universities about the great Comrade Stalin. Neither Abbas's subject nor the conclusions of his thesis strike one as original. It merely chews the cud of the all too familiar Islamic (and now Sharia leftist) conspiracy theory of Zionists and Nazis in their roles of what Abbas called 'partners in crime' in a plot to further the aim of Jewish emigration to Palestine. For good measure, he claims that at the very most, the number of Jews killed by the Nazis (with Zionist assistance and approval of course) was one million. The inflation of this figure to six million was a Jewish ploy to attract sympathy for the Zionist cause. Where Abbas led, others were only too eager to follow. *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida*, the official daily journal of the 'moderate' Palestinian Authority, claimed in its issue of June 24, 2003, that the Holocaust involved 'the entanglement [sic] of the Zionist leaders in the sacrifice of many Jews in order to kill two birds with one stone: on the one hand to be rid of those [non-Zionist Jews] who disagreed with them and on the other, to push all the [other] Jews to immigrate to Palestine.' Also just like Hamas, the PA daily claimed this version of the Holocaust was based on 'a known historical tradition'. Indeed it is. It goes by the name of Holocaust Denial.

Denying the Holocaust is in no sense just a Palestinian aberration, explicable (and no doubt for some, excusable) in the light of the history of the Middle East since the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948. It is the official position of the entire Arab world. In August 2002, the Arab League convened a symposium under

the Chairmanship of Sultan bin Zayed, Deputy Prime Minister of the United Arab Emirates, for the purpose of 'counter[ing] the lies and exaggerations about the Holocaust'. The Arab League, founded and initially presided over by Nazi collaborator the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem Haj Amin al Husseini in 1945, currently has 25 members, including the Palestinian Authority, with a population in 2023 of 473 million, most of whom, as surveys have shown, share the anti-Semitism of their rulers and clergy.

April 18 is Israel's Holocaust Remembrance Day. On that day in 2015, it was accompanied by a symmetric attack on its commemoration by Neo-Nazis in London and on the West Bank by the Palestinian Authority. At the four star Grosvenor Hotel in London Victoria, there gathered the leading lights of world Neo-Nazism past and present, ranging from veterans of Sir Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists to activists of the British National Party, Holocaust denier Lady Michel Renouf (who, accompanied by Corbyn's Westminster guest speaker James Thring) graced with her presence the London pro-Hamas march of July 26, 2014 headed by yes...the ubiquitous Comrade Corbyn), and from overseas, the Franco loyalist Pedro Varela and the editor of the pseudo-academic journal of the Neo-Nazi Holocaust denying 'Institute of Historical Review' based in California, the very same 'Institute' that as we have seen, promotes the writings and speeches of Adolf Hitler and Professor Noam Chomsky.

The official purpose of the function, the one dearest to Chomsky's heart, was to 'identify, counter and break Jewish-Zionist domination'. Any Sharia leftists attracted to the event by its billing could have easily have mistaken certain of its proceedings for those of BDS, the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign and its sister front, the Stop the War Coalition, especially when *Historical Review* editor Mark Weber rose to deliver his address on the theme 'The Challenge of Jewish-Zionist Power', or on hearing the cheers that greeted an approving reference to the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre. As a supporter of BDS, our intruder would also have endorsed Pedro Varela's call for a boycott of Jewish shops and businesses. In fact, the meeting was doing exactly what the Sharia left and its Muslim allies had been demanding, which was to expose the way Jews exploited Holocaust Remembrance to further the Zionist cause. Weighed against the bigger picture of the need to counter the intrigues of the Zionists, did it really matter that back in Spain, Varela was notorious for a speech he made in Madrid at another remembrance event, the annual commemoration of Hitler's birthday, when he declared that were 'never any gas chambers in Auschwitz'? After all, the Sharia left's Muslim allies say just the same, without it having any adverse effects on their united front against Zionism.

While Neo-Nazis did their bit in London for the anti-Zionist cause, the Palestinian Authority daily *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida* used the occasion firstly to once more deny the number of Holocaust victims and secondly, to yet again depict the Holocaust as a joint Nazi-Jewish enterprise to further the aims of Zionism: 'The supporters of the Zionist movement have exaggerated the number of victims, claiming that they amounted to six million, whereas other, unbiased [sic] researchers have estimated that there were between one and two million Jewish victims.' These 'unbiased researchers' are never named, but one suspects that one of them, though hardly meriting the description 'unbiased', was none other than the PA President himself, Mahmoud Abbas, with his PhD in Holocaust denial. We are then informed how and why a radically downsized Holocaust happened. It is familiar story, told, as we have seen, by anti-Semites of both left and right.:

The leaders of the Nazi and Fascist states conspired to make the Jews immigrate to Israel...Likewise, the Zionist movement wanted to achieve a series of goals. First, to take advantage of the Holocaust to blackmail the European state financially and politically to make them support the Zionist project to bully the Jews to immigrate to the Israel ethnic cleansing state.

This is what passes in the Arab and Muslim worlds for historical scholarship, promoted by an organisation variously financed and recognised by the Vatican, the USA, the European Union and the United Nations. How does it come about that western tax payers' money, to the tune of more than three billion dollars a year, can be misused to subsidise the dissemination of poisonous, palpable lies about the Jews by the Palestinian Authority's press, television and schools? What is truly astounding is that this long-standing and concerted Islamo-Arab drive to erase and then re-write the history of the Holocaust not only meets with no objections or resistance on the part of the Sharia left but is even, as we have seen, embellished by it. The dregs of what was once a movement that with justice prided itself on its defence of historical truth has now sunk so low as to equal in depravity, mendacity and audacity the slanders once heaped by Stalin on Leon Trotsky who, like the founders of Israel, was also accused of being a (Jewish) Nazi accomplice.

Some facts about the role, financing and not least, the staffing policy of UNRWA, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, might help to explain why the PA continued with total impunity to rear its young in the spirit of genocidal, Nazi-style Jew hatred, and to leave them in total ignorance as to the truth of the Holocaust. UNRWA, the only permanent, and by far the largest, of any UN relief organisations, is also unique in that it is the only UN relief organisation with a brief to deal solely with one designated people, the Palestinians, who are in virtually every case, falsely treated as refugees, the vast majority having been born not in Israel, but in its Arab neighbours. The UNRWA budget is by far the UN's largest, amounting in one year, 2012, to \$907,907,371. Of this sum, \$644,701,999, 71% of the total, came from a small group of donors; the USA, the EU, Japan and Norway. The UK, Sweden and the Netherlands also made separate contributions. As for the Palestinians' brothers-in-arms, the Muslim Arabs, oil rich Saudi Arabia, which spends trillions on property projects, mosque building and promoting Salafi Islam around the globe, ranked fifteenth in the list of donors, three places above Turkey, while Qatar, which can always find enough ready cash to buy up more London real estate, top flight football teams, finance Hamas and bribe FIFA delegates to secure the staging of the World Cup, gave precisely nothing, just as it refused, like the other states of the Arabian Peninsula, to offer asylum to fellow Muslims fleeing the Islam's civil wars. Instead, Qatar collaborated with its Middle Eastern neighbours in the cynical policy of pumping ever more waves of Muslim migrants into Europe, thereby furthering the goal of its creeping Islamisation.

Unlike any other UN agency, nearly all of UNRWA's 22,000 staff are selected from one national group...the Palestinians. This unprecedented practice is of course the surest guarantee that corruption and parasitism on the grandest scale imaginable will ensue, uninvestigated, unchecked and even approved. As a direct result, PA officials, in the first place President Mahmoud Abbas, who is 'worth' \$100 million, have accumulated for themselves immense personal wealth. With around a billion dollars flowing into the PA's coffers every year, much of it swallowed up by the top echelons of an inflated army of officials numbering 150,000, little wonder

there is precious little to show for it in the way of tangible benefits for the mass of the population for whom it is officially intended, with the result that many would prefer to live in 'genocidal', 'Apartheid' Israel. (See Appendix K for details)

When it comes to the PA's education and TV and programmes, should we then be surprised that the Palestinian staff of UNRWA find no fault with their overtly anti-Semitic content, and only go through the motions when they are asked to ensure that it stops? This is why instead of teaching the true history of the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews, on March 25, 2005, Palestinian Authority TV screened an anti-Semitic play for children accompanied by this charming little ditty

They [the Jews] are the ones who did the Holocaust
Their knife cuts into the length and the width of our flesh
They opened ovens for us, to bake human beings
They destroyed the villages and bunt the cities
And when the ovens stopped burning
They light a hundred more ovens
Their hands are covered with blood of our children.

To repeat, this is how history was and still is taught by the 'moderate' Palestinian Authority, recognised 'in principle' by the European Union, and funded by you, the reader. A Palestinian boy whose picture of the outside world and its history is largely if not wholly one which has been manufactured for him by western-funded Authority propaganda and educational agencies, can therefore be excused for believing that Nazis are Jews who want to exterminate his people, just as in all probability he will learn in time, possibly through less official channels, that Hitler was some kind of Muslim hero, who died fighting to the last against these same Jewish Nazis. He might even get around to wading his way through an Arabic translation of *Mein Kampf* by the Nazi convert to Islam Luis Heiden, as readily available at a number of book shops on the West Bank as it is in the Muslim quarter along London's Edgware Road. However, he is much more likely to come across one of the millions of copies of the *Protocols* that thanks to the efforts of Saudi Arabia's otherwise underemployed printing industry, currently circulate around the Arab world and beyond. When he is old enough to attend prayers at a West Bank or Gaza mosque, he will be certain to hear a sermon such the one preached in January 2012 by the revered Dr. Ahmed Yousuf Abu Halabiah, of the Palestinian Sharia Rulings Council and Rector of Advanced (sic) Studies at the Islamic University: 'They [the Jews] must be butchered and they must be killed as Allah said..."Fight them, Allah will punish them by your hands". Have no mercy on the Jews anywhere. In any country wherever you meet they kill them. Wherever you are, kill those Jews.' Not to be outdone in genocidal anti-Semitism, the Hamas Al-Aqsa TV channel also screens regular programmes in which children as young as four are indoctrinated in Nazi-style Jew hatred. The following exchange took place in a children's programme on May 21, 2014:

Presenter, (in a giant bee costume): 'Are there Jews where you are?'

Boy (aged no more than four): 'No, not now.'

Presenter: 'I heard they come to you every day.'

Boy: 'Yes, but not now.'

Presenter: 'Listen, friend, do like this with your hands [makes a fist] and when they come to you, punch them, make their faces red like a tomato.'

Boy: 'Allah willing, so that we can liberate Palestine.'

Presenter: 'Allah willing. My friend Qais, I tell him to take a stone, and when the Jews come, to take it and throw it at them.'

Teenage girl host: 'Of course, the Jewish neighbours...'

Presenter: 'to smash them.'

Host: 'If his neighbours are Jews or Zionists, yes?'

Host (to little girl): 'Tulin, why do you want to be a police officer?'

Girl: 'Like my uncle.'

Host: 'What does a policeman do?'

Presenter: 'He catches thieves, and people who make trouble'.

Host: 'And shoots Jews, right?'

Girl: 'Yes'.

Host: 'You want to be like him when you grow up?'

Girl nods.

Host: 'Allah willing, when you grow up.'

Girl: 'So that I can shoot Jews'.

Host: 'All of them?'

Girl: 'Yes'.

Host: 'Good'.

Not even the brainwashing of the young in the schools and youth movements of the Third Reich managed to plumb depths of depravity such as this. For here the incitement is not only to hate the Jews, but, and in this respect, it goes further than the Nazis, it is quite explicitly to kill them, to participate in a genocide of the Jews. It is hard to credit, but it is nevertheless true, that the Palestinian Authority, of which Hamas no less than Fatah is a constituent part, has been recognised by 137 states plus the Vatican as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and, in 2012, was awarded observer status at the United Nations. And let us recall that Deepa Kumar of the SWP assured her readers that Hamas had outgrown its early anti-Semitic prejudices and had learned how to distinguish between Jews and Zionism, that 'Hamas today [this was 2011] is a different organisation from the one that was founded in 1988'. The Hamas TV programme inciting children to commit genocide against the Jews *was broadcast in May 2014*.

This unrelenting anti-Jewish propaganda in the media is just one component of a more general programme to prepare the young for a war of extermination against the Jews. Each year, in the summer holidays, 25,000 Gaza children as young as 15 undergo military and religious instruction for *Jihad* against Israel. The camp's 500 instructors are all members of Ezaddin al Qassam, the military wing of Hamas. The declared purpose of the training is to 'prepare a new generation of Palestinian youth spiritually [sic], mentally and physically for the battle to liberate Palestine'. Since Israel and all Jewish settlers withdrew completely from the Gaza Strip in 2005, and has been under Hamas (mis) rule since 2006, 'liberating Palestine' can only mean liquidating Israel. Explaining the goal of the training programme, Khalil al-Hayah, a leading Hamas official, made it clear Hamas has no truck with western delusions of Islam as a 'religion of peace': 'These camps are designed to prepare a generation that carries the *Koran* and the rifle'.

Just as in Saudi Arabia and in the West Bank, and as it was for the youth of Nazi Germany, for the young of Gaza, there is no escape from this all-pervading, murderous hatred of the Jews. Instead of enjoying their school holidays, and a break from classroom anti-Semitic brainwashing, at these camps, children are encouraged

to see suicide bombers as role models to be emulated, just as at school and on television screens, they are to see the Jews as their target. Not even the most fanatical anti-Zionist has been able to produce an iota of evidence that Israeli schools, youth movements, TV, or any other media outlet, has promoted venomous racist, genocidal hatred such as this, or anything even remotely like it. In fact, it is illegal. Yet it is Israel that is accused of racism and genocide, Islam depicted as the religion of peace, tolerance and compassion, and Hamas promoted as a (no longer anti-Semitic) 'resistance movement'.

The indoctrination of the young (including very young) in Jew hatred is not confined to the openly Jihadist wing of Islam. It suits the rulers of Saudi Arabia to pose as the west's allies in what is supposed to be a combined campaign against a Jihadi terrorism they themselves are financing, not least because by doing so, they ensure that their abysmal record of human rights abuses and promotion of Jihadism will remain uncensored. Anyone viewing the kingdom's TV programmes will discover that like Fatah and Hamas, the instilling of anti-Semitism extends down to the very young, inciting a hatred of the Jews that knows no limits. What follows is an exchange that took place in once such programme in which a girl aged three and half years, swaddled in Islamic head dress to protect her from rape by adult male Muslims, is asked a series of leading questions:

Interviewer: 'What is your name?'

Girl: 'Basmallah'.

Int: 'Basmallah, how old are you?'

Girl: 'Three and a half'.

Int: 'Are you a Muslim?'

Girl: 'Yes'.

Int: 'Basmallah, are you familiar with the Jews?'

Girl: 'Yes'.

Int: 'Do you like them?'

Girl: 'No'.

Int: 'Why don't you like them?'

Girl: 'Because...'

Int: 'Because they are what?'

Girl: 'They're apes and pigs'.

Int: 'Who said they are so?'

Girl: 'Our God'.

Int: 'Where did he say this?'

Girl: 'In the *Koran*'.

The Jesuits used to say (perhaps they still do), 'give me a child until he is seven, and I will give you the man'. The Islamic version should read, 'give me the child, and I will give you an anti-Semite and maybe a Jihadi and a martyr', because already, by only half the age required by the Jesuits, Wahhabi Islam has this child in its grip and, if the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has its way, it will never let go. The rearing of young Jew-haters in the Middle East knows no limits, not even Hitler worship. In February 2011, there appeared in the PA, and therefore UN-funded children's monthly magazine *Zayzafuna*, an essay by a 10th grade school girl on the subject of Palestinian role models. Presented in the form of a dream, she described how she met, one by one, four men whom young Palestinians should admire and emulate. Three were Muslims; the ninth century mathematician Al-Khwarizmi, the

Egyptian Nobel Literature Prize winning author Naguib Mahfouz, and Saladin, vanquisher of the Crusaders. And the fourth?

I turned to the second door. There Hitler awaited me. I said, "you are the one who killed the Jews?" He said: "Yes, I killed them so you would know that they are a nation that spreads destruction all over the world. And what I ask of you is to be resilient and patient concerning the suffering that Palestine is experiencing at their hands." I said, "thank you for the advice."

To repeat one again: you, the reader, as a tax payer, without your consent and almost certainly without your knowledge, are helping to fund the indoctrination of the Palestinian young in Hitler worship and genocidal anti-Semitism. Adult adulation of the Nazis is equally well catered for in the Middle East, intruding even into televised discussions about football. In the run-up to the 2010 World Cup, former Lebanon Prime Minister Wiam Wahhab, a Druze closely allied with Hezbollah, was asked on TV which team he was backing: 'I support Germany in politics and Brazil in soccer. I like the way Brazil play. But I like the Germans because they hate the Jews and they burned them [laughs].'

In the manner of the 'doublethink' of Orwell's *1984*, where Big Brother expected party members to be able to simultaneously embrace as true two contradictory propositions, Palestinian leaders have developed this faculty to such a high degree that they can both deny the Holocaust and praise the one chiefly responsible for its execution. On January 16, 2016, in an interview on the *Ma'an* TV Channel, Fatah Central Committee member Tawfiq Tirawi, when questioned about Hitler's personal qualities, replied that 'Hitler was not morally corrupt, he was daring'. More double think was on display on Qatar-based Al-Jazeera TV on August 23, 2005, when the assertion was made firstly that the Holocaust 'was exploited to justify the Zionist policies and to justify the enemy [i.e., Israeli] state', to be followed by another that there was 'evidence and scientific research that prove the Holocaust is a lie.' Viewers were however once again left in the dark as to the nature of this 'evidence' and the identity of the 'researchers' who had brought it to light.

Arab Muslims do not have a monopoly on the theme of the Holocaust as an operation either engineered, greatly exaggerated or fabricated by Jews to further the aims of Zionism. Muslim convert Lauren Booth, Corbyn's co-presenter on Iran's Press TV and sister-in-law of former Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair, tells it like this: 'The Zionist groups refused Uganda, refused other pieces of other nations [sic] where they could have settled before enduring the Holocaust, but the [Jewish] leaders said "No, we would rather millions of Jews died but we got Palestine at the end of it". So they allowed it [the Holocaust] to happen.' Just whom did the 'Zionist groups' say this to? And if 'they allowed it', then they, the 'Zionist groups', presumably could, if they wished, have stopped it. In this account, the Nazis are nowhere to be seen. The guilt for the Holocaust is entirely a Jewish one. In other variants on the same theme, always un-named Nazis sometimes lurk in the background, but in all cases, visible or not they comply with the wishes of equally anonymous Zionists, who obviously have the whip hand. In Booth's version, the 'Zionist groups' cynically spurned any number of kind offers to save the Jews, and instead opted for their murder, which they then 'allowed to happen', in order that a few, presumably specially-selected Zionist Jews could 'get Palestine at the end of

it', though how the one led necessarily to the other was left unexplained, since Palestine was at the time under British, not Nazi rule. Perversely, Booth saw no problem with Jews being allotted 'pieces of other nations' which had absolutely no history of Jewish settlement, while opposing their presence in the only territory which does.

The facts of the matter are as follows. On the initiative of President Roosevelt, representatives of 32 states met at Evian-Les-Bains, France, in July 1938 to consider what help, if any, could be given to German and Austrian Jews attempting to flee from Nazi persecution. After much debate and protestations of what proved to be platonic sympathy, the conference ended without a single nation, including its convenor's, extending asylum to Jews who, if they remained trapped in Germany, were destined to die in the gas chambers of Hitler's Final Solution. Early the next year, in the wake of the Nazi occupation of the Sudentland, the Crystal Night pogrom and the annexation of Czechoslovakia, each of which added to the flow of Jewish refugees seeking to escape from Nazi terror, in order to appease Arab sentiments, Britain sealed off their last remaining escape route by banning and blocking all Jewish migration to the mandated territories. As a direct result of this policy, countless thousands of Jews needlessly died in the Holocaust. (See Addendum to Appendix A) Ignoramus Booth's version is pure Sharia fantasy. And how different from the sometimes-ecstatic welcome extended to the million and more Muslim migrants, many of them for sure deeply anti-Semitic, who flowed unhindered in the opposite direction, many, if not most, unlike the pre-war Jewish refugees, not fleeing from persecution or danger of death, but for motives that were purely economic.

Finally, we reach the point where it becomes virtually impossible to distinguish between the Islamo/Arab school of historical falsification, in which the Holocaust, if it happened at all, is only allowed to feature as evidence of the World Jewish Conspiracy, and that now embraced by the Sharia left. In 2019, Peter Gregson was, like so many other similar cases, only suspended from his Edinburgh branch of the Labour Party for his anti-Jewish activism, even though he had already been expelled from his union, GMB on the same grounds, which included promoting the leftist version of Holocaust denial. One example, closely resembling that of Lauren Booth, read as follows: 'So Hitler gassed millions of Jews, only they were the Bundists [an early 20th century eastern Europe Jewish socialist movement opposed to Zionism that numbered tens of thousands, not 'millions'], leaving the Zionists to crow over their dead ashes and demand a colony of their very own to make amends for their dead brothers and sisters who did not want to live in a racist colony at all, thank you very much.' Following his suspension, Gregson launched his 'Labour Against Zionist Islamophic [sic] Racism'. It sported a logo, a laser beam smashing the logo of the Labour Party-affiliated Jewish Labour Movement. Gregson's aim was to create a 'mass movement' comprised of like-minded Labour Party members (we can guess who they might be) to, quote, 'kick the Zionists out of the Labour Party, the trade unions, and anywhere else we can'. (Emphasis added) As in other similar cases (See Appendix T), attempts by Labour Party and GMB members to have Gregson expelled were rejected by the party's Corbynista-dominated disciplinary machinery. 'So far' said Gregson, 'all they have done is suspend me'. Gregson evidently believed he was yet another victim of an anti-Corbyn Zionist conspiracy in the Labour Party to silence the enemies of Israel: 'There is all this bogus [sic] anti-Semitism. Israel is terrified, they do not want

Corbyn as leader because he could be the first Prime Minister ever that tells Israel how to get off. They are terrified of that, because they are a racist country.'

Now our second case. In a letter to the UK Stalinist daily, the *Morning Star*, (which featured Corbyn as a weekly guest contributor) a Karl Dallas made the following claim: 'Zionists worked closely [of course!] with the Gestapo [who else?] to locate, identify and transport European Jews to the concentration camps, helped to confiscate their property and transfer the assets to bank accounts which included bank Leumi in Israel [Israel did not then exist].' Just as there are to be no limits to anti-Semitic credulity, there are no limits to the fabrications that nourish it. In this instance, even the plunder of the Jews by the Nazis was presented as Jewish plot to fund the aims of Zionism. Here follows a true account, based on documents discovered at Auschwitz after its liberation on January 27, 1945 by the Red Army, of what these 'assets' consisted of, and their final destination and use:

Before being sent to the gas chambers, the inmates were thoroughly shaved; sometimes they had to wait for that procedure many hours standing naked in the open air regardless of season and weather, men and women on a completely equal footing. The hair was sorted, packed in bags of 22kg and shipped to Germany for the production of felt, blankets and mattresses. On March 1945, 293 bags of women's hair were discovered in one of the warehouses. The bags weighed 7,000kg. and the experts of the investigating commission estimated that it had belonged to 140,000 women. Bones at the beginning were pounded, ground and thrown into the river. Then, in 1943, it dawned upon the managers that they could be put to more effective use; so they started selling the bones for processing into fertilizers. In the files found at the [Auschwitz] camp administration there were letters showing that 112.6 tons of bones were sent to the Stem [a German firm] plants for that purpose.

Most of the ashes were carried from the crematories directly to the farms in the vicinity for fertilizing.... Six cartloads of gold [mostly extracted from teeth] were sent to Germany to bolster the Reich economy.... In thirty-five stockrooms, the belongings of the murdered inmates were sorted and packed. Twenty-nine of them were set on fire before the Germans left; but the six that were left remained told the story. There were found: 348,820 items of men's apparel, 836,255 of women's wear, etc... Between December 1, 1944 and January 1945...Oberscharfuehrer SS Reichbach, the files disclosed, was able to ship to Germany 514,843 items of linen. Explicit orders from institutions and private persons to the SS were found requesting specified items such as baby carriages, trunks etc. Two [railway] carloads of eye-glasses were collected...Ten cars of the most exquisite women's wear were forwarded to Gotha, to the central store of SS fiancées... [The production of] soap from human fat was confirmed in Danzig and we find this production explicitly mentioned in a secret German document. (Max Weinreich: *Hitler's Professors*)

This how the Zionists, with a little help from their Nazi friends, went about financing the birth of the state of Israel.

For some on the Left, depicting the Holocaust as a means of furthering the aims of Zionism is not enough. The far left Jewish anti-Zionist Tony Greenstein, and, as such, a worthy successor to Noam Chomsky (for example, he describes the creation of Israel as 'Hitler's final victory') portrays the Holocaust as an event 'weaponised', to use the current term, by global imperialism, as here:

‘Zionism and the Israeli state claim ownership of the Holocaust and a monopoly on its interpretation. The Holocaust has become an integral part of the imperialist narrative, a justification for every[sic] act of aggression or war. In allowing the Holocaust to be used in this way, Zionism demonstrates its contempt for the memory of those who died.’ (*Zionism During the Holocaust: The Weaponisation of Memory in the Service of State and Nation*)

Another anti-Zionist Jew, Norman Finkelstein, has also accused Zionists of milking the Holocaust, in his *The Holocaust Industry*. This book was praised as, quote, ‘seminal’, by Labour MP Angela Rayner while serving as Corbyn’s Shadow Education Minister. She also dismissed accusations of Labour anti-Semitism as, quote, ‘a smear’. No action was taken as a result of these two comments. Indeed, as of October 2023, she was serving as Kier Starmer’s Shadow Deputy Prime Minister.

6 Mufti Meets Fuehrer

‘Our fundamental condition for collaborating with Germany was a free hand to eradicate every last Jew from Palestine and the Arab world’. (The autobiography of Haj Amin al- Husseini, Grand Mufti of Jerusalem)

‘What a hero, what a miracle of a man...Germany and Hitler have gone, but Amin al Husseini will continue the struggle. (Hasan al Bana, founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, on Haj Amin al Husseini’s return to Egypt in 1946)

One of the most often repeated objections to the creation of the state of Israel advanced by those few Arab and Muslim leaders who acknowledge the fact of the Holocaust is that the Palestinians in particular and the Arabs of the Middle East in general bore no responsibility for the Nazi extermination of the Jews, and that therefore there was no good reason why they should have been made to suffer for it by yielding up what they regarded as exclusively Arab territory to make way for a Jewish state. In fact, any Arab suffering as a result of the establishment of Israel of May 1948, was a direct consequence of its invasion by its Arab neighbours and, prior to that, of Arab and Muslim leaders in 1936 and again in 1947, rejecting out of hand first British and then United Nations proposals to create a totally independent Palestinian state in the British Mandate alongside a Jewish state where the Jews comprised a majority.

Having dealt with the second oft-repeated *canard*, what follows is a refutation of the first, namely the claim that that no Arabs or Muslims were complicit in or sought to benefit from the Nazi extermination of the Jews during the Second World War. Stated briefly, the evidence proves beyond all doubt that not only did the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, one of the most respected and influential personalities in the Arab and Muslim world, from the first days of the Third Reich, seek collaboration with Hitler in their common goal of the elimination of the Jews. As we shall see, had, as the Mufti hoped and expected, the Nazis won the war, there would have been more than sufficient Arab and Muslim collaborators willing to help him implement what Hitler went two thirds towards accomplishing in Europe - the total extermination of the Jews in the Middle East.

It was an historic moment. In May 2014, the President of the Czech Republic, Milos Zeman, took on the role of the child in the tale of the Emperors' New Clothes by being the first European statesman to call Islam by its true name, not a religion of peace, but one that was permeated with hatred of the Jews. The occasion was a speech he made at the Israeli Embassy in Prague to commemorate the sixty-sixth anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel. Commendably departing from protocol, in the course of his speech, he made some choice remarks, reinforced with a quotation from a relevant text, about the relationship between Islam and anti-Semitism. At last, after years, even decades of double-talk and evasions, here was a western statesman with the honesty and the courage to say what many others must surely think but, for a variety of reasons, none of them commendable, prefer to keep to themselves. The ‘context’ of his palpably angry speech was not

only the Israeli anniversary, but the murder, only a matter of days previously, of four Jews at the Brussels Jewish Museum by a Muslim, Mehdi Nemmouche, who had earlier proclaimed his loyalty to ISIS: 'I will not let myself be calmed down by the declaration that there were only tiny fringe groups behind it. I am convinced that this xenophobia, and let's call it racism or anti-Semitism, emerges from the very essence of the ideology these groups subscribe to.' President Zeman then made it very clear by his subsequent remarks that this ideology was not the 'Islamism' cynically concocted by Islamophiles to distinguish it from an entirely unrelated and supposedly genuine, but in fact imaginary, peaceful, tolerant, loving and ecumenical Islam. (Which begs the question, why then call it 'Islamism'?) He had evidently done what I have done, and what any literate person can do, even academics, students, politicians, journalists and clergypersons, which was to read one of a number of easily accessible texts, and decide whether or not they contained an Islamic sanctioning of the anti-Semitic terrorist acts in question. It is as simple as that. So President Zeman continued, quoting from Article Seven of the Hamas Charter, which in its turn cites a saying attributed to Mohammed in the *Hadith* of Buhkari, regarded by all Muslim scholars and schools as the most reliable of such sources:

Let me quote one of their sacred texts to support this statement: "A tree says, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him". I do not know of any movement calling for the mass-murdering of Arabs. However, I do know of one anti-civilisation movement calling for the mass murder of Jews. After all, one of the paragraphs of the statutes of Hamas says, "kill every Jew you see." Do we really want to pretend that this is an extreme viewpoint? Do we really want to be politically correct and say that everyone is nice and only a small group of extremists and fundamentalists is committing such crimes?' Let us throw away political correctness and call things by their true names.

Here for the first time was a direct challenge by a Western head of state to the powers that be of world Islam. They felt obliged to reply. But in doing so, they touched upon matters that for self-evident reasons, have remained largely a closed subject since the end of the Second World War, and at no time in that period more than now. The response came in the form of an accusation of blasphemy against President Zeman, (absurd, since he was not Muslim) issued by the 57-member Organisation of the Islamic Conference (two of whose leading members, Shi'a Iran and Sunni Saudi Arabia, rather than conferring, were at the time in a state of proxy war in Yemen. As of 2023, the number of dead had reached 150,000, without so much as a peep from the *dhimmi* left and Muslim protest industries.) The statement was issued in the name of the OIC Secretary-General, the top-ranking Saudi politician Iyad Ameen Madani, and therefore, given the dominant role of the Saudi Kingdom in the organisation, can be safely assumed to reflect its own stance on the issues involved. We shall focus on the central proposition in dispute, the one that because it is true, stung Madani the most, namely that Islam is inherently anti-Semitic and moreover, in ways analogous to Nazism. But as we do, let us keep in mind the accusation by apologists for Islam and Jihadi terrorism, one that we have already encountered frequently in this work and will do so again, that not Islam, but Zionism is equivalent to Nazism, that Israel is a genocidal, Nazi state, and that all Jews who defend the right of Israel to exist are, *ipso facto*, Nazis. The boot, as we shall see, is on the other foot.

There is an abundance of evidence, textual and otherwise, proving not only that Islam is anti-Semitic, but also that of all the OIC's 57 member states, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, has done the most to ensure that not only its own subjects, but by financing Islamic schools and Mosques across the diaspora, countless millions of Muslims around the world from earliest childhood onwards are indoctrinated in a culture of anti-Semitism no less vicious than that promoted by the professional Jew-baiters of Nazi Germany. This it has done even to the extent of using the same text cited by Hitler as proof of a world Jewish conspiracy, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, as source material in Saudi secondary schools. Such evidence, a sample of which has been cited above, and more of which now follows, will prove beyond any doubt that Saudi Arabia, in addition to performing the crucial strategic function of the authoritative voice of Sunni Islam, is also the prime source that feeds its anti-Semitism. Perhaps assuming that those to whom his reply was addressed did not have access to this evidence, the OIC Secretary General felt free to present a picture of Islam at total variance with the one enshrined in its holy texts and recorded in its history, and which, especially since 9/11, despite the lies told by its political and clerical establishment, the non-Muslim world has come to know by bitter and often monumentally tragic experience. Unable to challenge the authenticity of the *hadith* quoted by President Zeman, Madani instead took issue with his claim, made on a previous occasion, when, according to Madani, Zeman had 'linked believers in the *Koran* with anti-Semitic and racist Nazism'.

Rashly, in view of evidence to the contrary, Madani insisted that nothing could be further from the truth. By making such an allegation, President Zeman had displayed a 'lack of knowledge and misunderstanding of Islam'. Perhaps he meant that if he had adopted the approach recommended by an authority we have already encountered, President Zeman would have realised that when a *hadith* said 'kill the Jews', this is only the 'surface meaning', and when the *Koran*, as it does more than once, calls the Jews 'apes and swine', he should have understood, as all Muslims invariably do, that these are simply terms of endearment. President Zeman was apparently also in error when he 'ignored the historical fact that anti-Semitism and Nazism are a European phenomenon through and through. They have no roots in Islam either as a religion or as a history or civilisation. The Holocaust did not take place in the area from North Africa to Indonesia.' All of these assertions and denials were untrue. Not only this. In due course, we will see that the very organisation on whose behalf its Secretary General issued his formal repudiation of any connection between Islam and Nazism was pioneered by, and chose as its first President, none other than the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, the war-time guest of Hitler, the generously funded Nazi collaborator, *confidante* of Adolf Eichmann and Heinrich Himmler, the would-be architect of his own Islamo-Arab 'Final Solution of the Middle Eastern Jewish Question', Haj Amin al-Husseini. So one has to admire if not his honesty, then certainly Ameen Madani's truly Jewish *chutzpah* in claiming that a 'civilisation' and its religion whose holiest text, not once but three times, likens Jews to 'apes and swine' and six times commands that Muslims should not take them as friends, was uncontaminated by anti-Semitism.

But first, some samples of the kind of anti-Semitism that is promoted by Iyad Ameen Madani's Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, birthplace of the prophet and custodian of the holiest places of Islam, if not of the lives of its pilgrims. (Since 1990, more than six thousand Mecca pilgrims have died in stampedes or other incidents. The

Saudi authorities routinely attribute these fatalities not to their own negligence, but to the will of Allah. Here they are on irreproachably sound doctrinal ground: ‘...a soul cannot die except by God’s leave; the term being fixed as if by writing’. *Koran*, Chapter, 3 Verse 145) For all his disclaimer that anti-Semitism is a ‘European phenomenon’, Ameen Madani’s own kingdom is no slouch when it comes to pumping out its own theocratic brand of Jew-baiting. In view of the intensity and volume of the anti-Semitic barrage sustained by the Saudi media, it is possible to cite only a small but nevertheless representative sample of its output. In less than two years, these amongst many other anti-Semitic diatribes were either broadcast by official Saudi TV Channels or published in the Kingdom’s press:

O God, support the Mujahidin in Palestine, O God, deal with the tyrant Jews, for they are within your power, O God, we ask You to face them and spare us their evils. (Broadcast of live sermon by Shaykh Husayn al-Shaykh from the holy mosque in Mecca, August 30, 2002)

O God, destroy the tyrant Jews. O God, deal with the Jews and their supporters, O God, destroy them for they are within you power. (Broadcast of live sermon by Shaykh Usamah bin-Abdallah Khayyat from the holy mosque in Mecca, July 12, 2002)

O God, the Jews have transgressed all limits in their tyranny. O God, shake the ground under their feet, pour torture on them and destroy all of them. (Broadcast of sermon by Shaykh Abd-al-Bari al-Thubayti, July 7, 2002)

...the Jews’ spilling human blood to prepare pastry for their holidays [the Passover] is a well-established fact, historically and legally, all throughout history. This was one of the main reasons for the persecution and exile that were their lot in Europe and Asia at various times. (*The Jewish Holiday of Purim* by Dr. Umayma Ahmad Al-Jalalma of King Faysal University, published in the Saudi government daily, *Ar-Riyadh* March 10 and 12, 2002)

Anyone who even skims through *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, *Pieces on the Chessboard*, or the book, *The World is a Pawn in the Hands of Israel*, and follows current events, becomes convinced that the Jews are behind the world's current "terrorised" atmosphere. (*The Jews Want to Take Over the World* by Prince Mamdouh bin Abd Al-Aziz, President of the Saudi Centre for Strategic Studies [sic], January 23, 2002)

Muslim brothers in Palestine, do not have any mercy neither compassion on the Jews, their blood, their flesh. Their women are yours to take legitimately. God, make them yours. Why don’t you enslave their women? (Sermon by Shaikh Saad Al-Buraik)

Through this infiltration of the various American administrations, and through controlling the media and money, the Jews impose their agenda on the other people. The Jewish sense of superiority, whose aim is to recruit the peoples and their resources for the good of the Jewish interests and their racial state Israel, remain unchanged. (*The Jewish Sense of Superiority in the World* by Abdallah Aal Mahli, published in the Saudi daily, *Al Watan*, December 28, 2001)

This drip feed, or rather torrent, of officially promoted Jew-hatred, unrivalled since the last years of the Third Reich has, like Hitler's, achieved what it was intended to do. This was confirmed by a survey conducted by Saudi TV into the Kingdom's public attitude towards the Jews. Typical amongst the responses were that the Jews were 'our eternal enemies', 'murderers', 'the enemies of Allah and his prophet' and 'the filthiest people on the face of the earth'. Not content with brainwashing its own subjects into a Nazi-style loathing of the Jews, the Saudi Kingdom exports its racist bile not only to the rest of the Arab and Muslim worlds but far beyond, where, for example, it is inserted into the curricula of Islamic educational institutions in the United Kingdom. In 2010, the BBC reported that 40 weekend schools for the instruction of the children of Muslim parents, all funded and supervised by the Saudi government, were using educational materials, produced and supplied by Saudi Arabia that were blatantly anti-Semitic and also anti-Christian. An eighth-grade textbook contained the following passage: 'The apes are the people of the Sabbath, the Jews, and the swine are the infidels of the Communion of Jesus.' Despite repeated requests by UK Education Ministry officials for the removal of these materials, and promises to do so by the Saudis, the practice of indoctrinating pupils in anti-Semitism continues in the diaspora, just as it does in Saudi Arabia and throughout the Middle East. And it is difficult, if not impossible, to see how it can be prevented, given that the source of the items objected to is Islam's most holy text. This disposes of the Secretary General's claim that 'anti-Semitism has no roots in Islam'. What of his similar disavowal of any Islamic connection with Nazism, and his claim that the Holocaust was a uniquely European event?

Before examining the historical evidence that proves the contrary, there is the matter of the Saudi monarchy's own Nazi and Neo-Nazi connections. In the lead-up to the Second World War, as part of the Third Reich's drive to secure a foothold in the strategically crucial Middle East, with its vast oil reserves and Suez Canal, the Nazis established close diplomatic links with the Saudi monarchy. In June 1939, King Saud's political adviser, Khalid al-Qarqani, had two secret top-level meetings in Berlin, first with Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop, on June 8. and then with Adolf Hitler on June 17. The encounter with the *Fuehrer* proved to be a meeting of minds: 'We view the Arabs with the warmest sympathy for three reasons. First, we do not pursue any territorial aspirations in Arab lands. Second, we have the same enemies [i.e., the British]. And third, we both fight against the Jews. I will not rest until the very last of them has left Germany.' Hitler then assured the Saudi envoy of his willingness to provide 'active assistance' to achieve their common goals. He lived up to his word. It was through Saudi Arabia that Germany supplied arms to a Muslim revolt in the British Palestinian Mandate later that summer. The Saudis repaid the debt when on the outbreak of the war, together with neighbouring Yemen, they defied British pressure to break off diplomatic relations with the Third Reich. In recognition of their stand, in May 1941, Axis Radio, an Arabic language Nazi radio station, praised Saudi Arabia as being the only Arab country that was 'free from the evils brought on innocent Arabs by the British', while in same year, the Nazi Islam specialist, Hans Lindemann, awarded Saudi Arabia the ultimate accolade of being a 'Third Reich in the Wahhabi style'. Even as late as October 28, 1944, when it had been obvious for more than a year that Germany had lost the war, in an after-dinner speech delivered in his palace to foreign diplomats, King Abdul Aziz al Saud could still not resist the opportunity to heap Nazi-style abuse on the

Jews, boasting that unlike Germany, his kingdom had always been *Judenfrei*:

We Muslims are aware of their machinations and we hate them from the depths of our being. Our hatred of this sinful and evil race is growing day by day until our ambition is to slay them all. Where we see them encroaching on us, we Muslims will fight them and butcher them until we have driven them from our lands. Allah be praised we have no Jews in our kingdom and never shall we allow one Jew to enter

And anti-Semitism has no roots in Islam? Or in its birth place, Saudi Arabia? Anti-Semitism and Nazis are ‘a European phenomenon through and through’? The Saudi-Nazi connection did not end with Germany’s defeat in the Second World War. In the 1970s, the kingdom chose to employ as its officially accredited and registered lobbyist none other than the US Neo-Nazi author William Grimstad. In return for his services, the Saudis financed the publication of his Holocaust denying book, *Six Million Re-considered*. The Saudis also provided generous funding for the Pakistan-based World Muslim Congress, established by the Grand Mufti after the First World War to propagate its virulently anti-Semitic brand of Palestinian nationalism. With these resources, the Council produced and distributed world-wide vast quantities of Neo-Nazi and Holocaust denial materials, mailing them *gratis* to targeted groups and individuals that included UK MPs and members of the US Congress.

It will become clear in the course of this work that Saudi Arabia is far from being alone in promoting Nazi-style Islamic anti-Semitism. In Egypt, vilification of the Jews has often been accompanied by an unashamed glorification of the Holocaust’s chief architect, as in the case of the writer Anis Mansour who, as reported in *Le Monde* of August 21, 1973, instead of denying the Holocaust, celebrated it, proclaiming that ‘the world is now aware of the fact that Hitler was right and that the cremation ovens were the appropriate means of punishing such contempt of human values [sic], principles, religions and laws.’ Two years later, Mansour represented Egypt at the fortieth International PEN conference. But anti-Semitism has no roots in Islam. (For another PEN scandal involving Islam, see Chapter27)

We have seen that a common thread running through many revisionist, and this includes Islamic, accounts of the Holocaust is that of the Nazis, in so far as they figure in them at all, playing the role of eager promoters of Zionism by killing off, either with the agreement, assistance or even on the instructions of the Zionist leadership, only those Jews who were opposed to the creation of a Jewish state in the Middle East. Why the Nazis would want to do this is never explained. Perhaps we are expected to assume they did it because the all-powerful Jews told them they had to. In these accounts, which are churned out almost daily by Middle East media, to be sanitised and then re-cycled by the Sharia left, the picture is of the Nazis, for all their oft-proclaimed sympathies for the Arabs, as naive goys, duped by the Jews into promoting a Zionist conspiracy against the world in general and the Palestinians in particular. We are also invited by the likes of Livingstone to believe that the Nazis had set their sights on the goal of creating a Jewish state in the Middle East while they were *at the same time* collaborating with the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, and other Islamic and Arab leaders, for the purposes of exterminating all the Jews living in the same region. Since they totally contradict each other, only one at most of these scenarios can be true. And while

there is not a shred of evidence to support the first claim, there is ample to prove beyond any doubt the latter. Let us begin with the aspiring architect of a Middle Eastern 'final solution', the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem who, as we have already seen, first met Hitler in Berlin on November 28, 1941. (A Mufti is an Islamic scholar authorised to issue *fatwahs*, that is, edicts that guide Muslim behaviour, and to make rulings on matters of Islamic jurisprudence.) Haj Amin al-Husseini was ideally suited for such a mission. Appointed, ironically in view of his later collaboration with Nazi Germany, by the British in 1921 to succeed his deceased half-brother, he had already been arrested the previous year for inciting a pogrom of Jews in Jerusalem. He was then released under an amnesty granted by the British High Commissioner. More anti-Jewish riots ensued, with al-Husseini, now in his new role of Grand Mufti, at their head. The Mufti's stance on the 'Palestine question' at this time is best captured by his pledge that 'the Zionists will be massacred to the last man. We want no progress; [sic] no prosperity [sic]. Nothing but the sword will decide the fate of this country'. Twenty years later, in a meeting with Hitler in Berlin, the Mufti sought and was promised not swords but *Panzers*.

Once appointed Grand Mufti, al-Husseini set about capturing and creating movements and organisations that over time, provided him with the leverage to become the leading voice not only in Palestinian affairs, but the broader Arab and Muslim worlds. First came the Supreme Muslim Council, established by the British in 1922, with the Mufti as its President. Richly endowed with funds from a variety of sources, the Council, which in practice meant the Mufti, was responsible for the appointment of preachers in all the Mandate's mosques, teachers at seminaries, judges of Sharia courts and all other officials that had a religious function. Subsequently, al-Husseini would consolidate his power base by creating a number of overtly political bodies to further his aim of challenging British rule and the Jews he mistakenly believed the Mandatory administration was favouring.

The Mufti's first campaign against Zionist settlement in the Mandate climaxed in August 1929, when armed Muslim gangs murdered more than a hundred Jews. Holy man al-Husseini urged them on: 'Slaughter Jews wherever you find them. Their spilled blood pleases Allah, our history and our religion.' Hitler could not have found a more amenable partner in genocide than the cleric destined to lay the foundations of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, from 2014 to 2016, headed by none other than Iyad Ameen Madani. Following Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on January 30, 1933, on March 31, the Mufti contacted Heinrich Wolff, the German Consul in Jerusalem, to assure him that 'Muslims inside and outside Palestine welcome the new regime of Germany and hope for the extension of the fascist, anti-democratic governmental system to other countries'. Obviously aware that the very next day, in Germany the Nazi regime was to stage a boycott of all Jewish shops and enterprises, the Mufti continued: 'Muslims hope for a boycott of the Jews in Germany because it would then be adopted with enthusiasm in the whole Muslim world.' But not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC.

With rise of fascist movements across Europe in the middle and late 1930s, al-Husseini's hopes were being fulfilled. He must have felt his time had come. Chaffing at British rule, which sought to maintain a precarious balance between Arab and Jewish interests, the Grand Mufti took another step along the road to collaboration with the Third Reich when, in 1935, he founded his own fascist-styled para-military movement, the Palestinian Arab Party, together with its youth section, known as the Nazi (sic!) Scouts. The following year, after yet more Arab rioting

and Mufti-inspired murders of Jews, as the mandated power, the British established a commission charged with seeking a long-term solution to the future of the territory, dominated as it was by the conflict between the Zionist aspirations of its growing number of Jews, and the hostility that they engendered amongst much of the Mandate's Arab population. (But not all of the murders instigated by the Mufti were of Jews. al-Husseini marked down for assassination more than a dozen leaders of rival factions in the Mandate's Arab community, including the Mayors of Hebron, Haifa and Nablus.)

The Peel Commission's recommended solution, one that foreshadowed that of the United Nations in 1947, was a three-way partition in which the Arabs were allotted 85% of Mandate territory, while the Holy Places were placed under a new mandate, and the Jews allocated the remainder, a narrow strip along the coast, where they constituted a clear majority of the population. Also as in 1947, the Zionist leadership accepted the proposals, while all the neighbouring Arab states, at al-Husseini's instigation, rejected them out of hand, whereupon the British shelved the plan. It was the first of two missed opportunities by Arab leaders to achieve a peaceful and equitable resolution of the Palestine question by the adoption of what would later come to be known as the 'two- state solution'. (The second was the UN resolution of November 29, 1947, creating Jewish and Palestinian states in the mandated territories.) It would soon become obvious that what the Grand Mufti sought, in alliance with Hitler, was not a two-state but a Middle Eastern equivalent of the Nazis' 'final solution', just as his Jihadi successors do today. There was also another aspect of the Mufti's *modus operandi* which, like his predilection for settling political disputes by murder, is today accepted practice amongst Arab leaders; namely, corruption, especially the misuse of funds intended for welfare purposes. A joint statement signed by no fewer than eight of the Mufti's former staff had an all-too familiar ring and could just as easily be describing the misuse of United Nations grants to the Palestinian Authority. After listing numerous substantial sums donated to the Mufti by various agencies and supporters, the letter continues:

There are millions of pounds, but can Haj Amin at least point to a single mosque, a school, a hospital he has erected? Did he build a shelter or asylum or a charity cistern from which the poor tramps could drink? Can he explain where and how these contributions were spent at the time when we the Mujahidin cannot find anything with which to maintain ourselves except through begging? Is His Eminence aware the majority of the Mujahidin, now dispersed in Syria and the Lebanon, are homeless and go to sleep homeless, while his Eminence's friends, supporters and relatives live in luxury, receive large salaries from the relief funds of orphans and spend their nights in cabarets, live with dancers and each one of them has a number of stray girls?

Plus la change. Following the overthrow of the Muslim Brotherhood's incipient theocracy in July 2013, Egyptian TV took great delight in displaying images of one of Corbyn's 'friends', Khaled Mashaal, the billionaire boss of Hamas, disporting himself, together with his acolytes, far from the scene of the action, in a seven-star Qatar hotel with a harem of Russian prostitutes.

And yet for all his vices, the Mufti undoubtedly possessed a certain charisma, which he skilfully exploited to create and then direct a succession of overlapping movements, two of which, in a new guise, speak for the worlds of Arabism and

Islam to this day. Some, like the World Islamic Congress, (forerunner of the present day 57-member Organisation of the Islamic Conference) founded in 1931 were overtly religious, while others, such as his 'Arab Higher Committee', founded in 1936, which had as its goal the creation of a 'Jew free' independent Palestinian state, were attuned to the more secular appeals of Arab nationalism. This committee in its turn led, in 1945, to the founding in Cairo of the Arab League that we know today. (The Mufti's years of war-time collaboration with the Nazis, far from proving a handicap, helped to ensure that he would be chosen as its first President.) Yet with the doings of Islam and the Arabs rarely out of our daily news, how many know that both organisations were founded, *pace* Ameen Madani, by Hitler's most favoured collaborator of the Second World War? But it is the Jews who are the Nazis of today.

Having raised his political profile not only in Palestine but further afield, in 1937, the Mufti renewed his contacts with the Nazi regime. After being visited by al-Husseini on July 15, 1937, the German Ambassador in Jerusalem reported to the Foreign Ministry in Berlin that the Mufti had 'stressed Arab sympathy for the new Germany and expressed the hope that Germany was sympathetic towards the Arab fight against Jewry and was prepared to support it.' This contact was followed up when Adolf Eichmann, a rising star in the SS and later to serve under Himmler as one of his principal executants of the Holocaust, conducted an extensive exploratory tour of the Middle East, arriving in Haifa on October 5, 1937. Made to leave by the British two days later, he travelled to Cairo, where either, according to one account, he met the Mufti personally, or to another, his emissaries dispatched from Jerusalem. His report described houses in the Mandate 'adorned with swastikas and portraits of Hitler'. Evidently, the Mufti's efforts on behalf of the Nazi cause were bearing fruit. Eichmann's report urged that these Nazi sympathisers should be rewarded by blocking Jewish refugee migration to the Mandate. Eichmann's next, final and fatal visit to the Holy Land followed his kidnapping by Mossad agents twenty-three years later in Argentina to stand trial for his part in the Holocaust. The operation was swiftly condemned by the United Nations Security [sic] Council, four of whose five permanent members had prematurely released from prison, found employment for, or simply allowed to escape thousands of Nazi war criminals, and unlike Israel, had long lost interest in hunting down any more. And at no time did the UN see fit to condemn the complicity of the Vatican in facilitating the flight to South America and the Middle East of several thousand Nazis officials, many of them, like Eichmann, wanted war criminals, at the end of the war.

Shortly after the Eichmann visit, the Mufti despatched to Berlin his personal representative, the German-speaking Dr. Said Imam. He brought with him a message from al-Husseini to be delivered to the Nazi leadership, one which pledged that if the Third Reich supported the 'Arab independence movement ideologically and materially', then in return, the Mufti would 'disseminate National Socialist ideas in the Arab-Islamic world' and 'combat communism' by 'employing all possible means.' Not so, said the Secretary-General of the OIC. Yet there is unambiguous documentary evidence retrieved from German archives at the end of the war that the Nazis had in fact begun to fund the Mufti's activities no later than the riots he instigated in 1936. By 1938, al-Husseini was on the payroll of the *Abwehr*, the German military intelligence agency headed by Admiral William Canaris. They also prove the complicity of the Saudi monarchy in the Nazi strategy

to destabilise the Middle East. Little wonder then that the Saudi Secretary-General of the OIC, who surely must have known this to be the case, was at such pains to deny any association between Islam and the Third Reich. A summary of the sources examined by the Office of the US Chief of Counsel for the prosecution of Axis criminality reads as follows:

1. Only through the funds made available by Germans to the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem was it possible to carry out the revolt in Palestine.
2. Germany will keep up the connection with the Grand Mufti. Weapons will be stored for the Mufti with Ibn Saud [the then King of Saudi Arabia] in Arabia.
3. Ibn Saud has close connections with the Grand Mufti and the revolting [sic] circles in Trans-Jordan.
4. To be able to carry out our work, one of our [i.e., Germany's] agents will be placed in Cairo.

Contrary to the version of his country's history offered by the Secretary-General of the OIC, in January 1939, the Saudi monarchy signalled its readiness to do business with the Nazis when it established full diplomatic relations with the Third Reich. Then, on June 8, 1939, more than two years before the grand Mufti's arrival in Berlin and his meeting with Hitler, Khalid Al-Hud Al-Qarqani, the Royal Councillor of King ibn Saud, was received in the German capital by Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop. According to an account of their meeting, Ribbentrop 'expounded to Khalid his general sympathy towards the Arab world and pointed out that Germany and the Arabs were linked by a common foe in the shape of the Jews. Khalid answered that [King Ibn Saud] attached the greatest importance to entering into relations with Germany.' But not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC. As we have seen, an audience with Hitler followed, during which an undertaking was given to provide material support for Arab resistance to British influence in the Middle East. This consisted of 8,000 rifles and eight million rounds of ammunition, light anti-aircraft guns, armoured cars, the construction of a munitions plant in Saudi Arabia and, as a personal gift from one anti-Semite to another, a specially-built Mercedes. The purpose of the arms agreement was 'to increase the flow of weapons the King had been secretly sending to Arabs fighting to check the Zionist [i.e., Jewish] influx that had followed the Balfour Declaration.' The Saudi collaboration with the Nazis was entirely consistent with King ibn Saud's opinion of the Jews, 'a race cursed by God ['apes and swine'] and destined to destruction and eternal damnation' Anti-Semitism an exclusively 'European phenomenon'? Nothing to do with Islam? Parallel with the Mufti's pre-war agitation in the British Mandate, and to a degree in competition with his essentially theocratic orientation, there began the rise in French-ruled Syria of secular Pan-Arabism in the shape of what would become in 1940 the Ba'ath Party of Michel Aflaq, and which in its Iraqi branch, spawned the fascist regime of the genocidist Saddam Hussein. Like al-Husseini, Ba'athism looked to Nazi Germany as an ally in its struggle against colonial, in this case, French rule, but also, unlike the Mufti, for secular ideological inspiration. As one of its co-founders, Sami al-Joundi, later recalled, 'We admired the Nazis. We were immersed in reading Nazi literature and books. We were the first who thought of an Arabic translation of *Mein Kampf*. Anyone who lived in Damascus at that time was witness to the Arab inclination towards Nazism.' Not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC.

Always with his eyes on Berlin as the only viable source of support for his goal of an independent Palestine, the Mufti must have taken heart from a comment made by Hitler in a speech welcoming the Sudetenland Germans into the Third Reich after the Munich Agreement of September 1938: 'Take the Arab Palestinians as your ideal. With unusual courage, they fight both England's British Empire and the world Jewry. They have no protector or helper. I give you [the Sudeten Germans] the means and weapons.' 'No helper'? Hitler would soon remedy matters. Al Hussein would also have been greatly heartened in his quest for a settlement of accounts with the Jews of the Middle East by Hitler's now notorious speech of January 30, 1939, on the sixth anniversary of his appointment as German Chancellor., in which for the first time he publicly announced his intention, not to help German Jews settle in Palestine, as claimed by amongst other anti-Semites, Ken Livingstone, but to exterminate all the Jews of Europe:

One thing I should like to say on this day which may be memorable for others as well as for us Germans. In the course of my life I have very often been a prophet and have usually been ridiculed for it. During the time of my struggle for power, it was in the first instance the Jewish race which only received my prophecies with laughter when I said that one day I would take over the leadership of the state, and with it that of the whole nation, and that then among many other things I would settle the Jewish problem. Their laughter was uproarious, but I think that for some time now they have been laughing on the other side of their face. Today I will be a prophet: If the international Jewish financiers in and outside Europe should succeed in plunging the nations once more into a world war, then the result will not be the Bolshevisation of the earth, but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe.

Wanted by the British for his subversive activities in the Mandate, after a series of political escapades in Lebanon and Syria, al Hussein arrived in Iraq in October 1939, where he was subsequently complicit in the abortive pro-Nazi coup of Rashid Ali in April 1941, issuing a *fatwa* designed to drum up support for the short-lived regime. Broadcast over Axis as well as Iraqi radio stations, it called upon all Muslims to rally to the Axis cause as the means to achieve their own liberation from British rule: 'I invite you, O brothers to join in the war for God to preserve Islam, and your independence and your lands from English aggression...God is with Thee, the Arab nation and the Muslim world are solidly with Thee in in thy holy struggle.' Fleeing Iraq after the collapse of the coup, al-Husseini arrived in Iran, where he was a guest of first, the German embassy, then the Bulgarian and finally, the Japanese legation (this was before Pearl Harbour) before re-surfacing in Rome, where he met Mussolini. His arrival in the Italian capital was dramatically announced on Rome Radio on October 24, 1941: 'The Mufti of Jerusalem, last heard of taking refuge in the Japanese legation in Tehran, has arrived in southern Italy. Italy, who knows the Mufti's sentiments of friendship and admiration for fascism and the *Duce* and is glad to know he is safe.' '...friendship and admiration for fascism'? Not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC. In the course of his peregrinations around the Muslim world, despite war-time difficulties of communication, the Mufti was able to maintain his links with the Nazis. When Hussein learned of Hitler's victories in the west, on July 6, 1940, he asked von Papen, German ambassador to Turkey, to 'convey to his Excellency the Great Chief and Leader my sincerest felicitations on the occasion of the great political and military triumphs which he has achieved through his foresight and genius...the Arab nation everywhere feels the greatest joy

and deepest gratification on the occasion of these successes.’ The Palestinian and Nazi causes were now joined in a common struggle against ‘the democracies and international Jewry’, and ‘the Arab people, slandered, maltreated and deceived by our common enemies, confidently expect that the result of our victory will be their independence and liberation.’ A matter of weeks later, al-Husseini’s private secretary, Osman Kemal Haddad, met a number of high-ranking Nazi officials in Berlin to discuss ways in which the Nazi Germany and the Muslim world could co-ordinate their efforts against their common foes. Then on January 20, 1941, while in Baghdad, the Mufti sent his first letter, eleven pages no less, to Hitler. Again, the message was the same, the shared goals and enemies of Muslims, Arabs and Nazis. Through his State Secretary Ernst von Weizsacker, Hitler ‘sent his regards and his thanks and best wishes for the continued success of the Arab cause’, agreeing with the Mufti that ‘Germany and Arabs have common enemies in the English and the Jews’. Now the wheels really began to turn. On March 11, von Weizsacker passed on to Haddad Hitler’s decision to recognise al-Husseini’s leadership of the Muslims and Arabs of the Middle East. Within the month, he was paid a retainer of one hundred thousand Reichsmarks, and the first payment of a monthly salary of 20,000. Another letter from Hitler followed on April 3, again pledging his support for the Arab cause. With an eye to an alliance with the senior partner in the Axis, the Mufti, after his short stay in Italy as the guest of Mussolini, moved from Rome to Germany, arriving in Berlin on November 6, 1941. But before his departure from Rome, al-Husseini issued a statement that made it clear what he expected in return for rallying support among the Arabs and Muslims for the Axis cause. Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany would have to ‘settle the question of Jewish elements in Palestine and other Arab countries in accordance with the racial interests of the Arabs and along the lines similar to those used to solve the Jewish question in Germany and Italy.’ In other words, by extermination. But not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC.

The prospects for the kind of alliance the Mufti had in mind were much enhanced by the fact that whereas Germany’s enemies, the Soviet Union (invaded by Germany on June 22, 1941) and Britain, ruled over tens of millions of Muslims, Hitler’s still-expanding empire was composed almost entirely of infidels. Turning the tables on the Britain’s Arab strategy in the First World War, when most of the Middle East was still under Germany’s Turkish ally, the Mufti could perform for Hitler the role of a pro-Nazi Lawrence, one made all the easier because, unlike the western Allies, who were avowedly fighting a war for individual freedom and democracy, neither the Mufti nor his Nazi patrons would be hamstrung by having to invoke these goals among peoples to whom they were culturally alien. All this was well understood in Berlin. Even before the Mufti’s meeting with Hitler, the possibility of a Nazi-Muslim alliance had been explored and advocated in a number of studies and memoranda by German experts in Arab and Islamic affairs. Like many other Nazi officials and academics, the former German ambassador to Egypt, Eberhard von Stohrer, not only saw many similarities between Islam and National Socialist doctrine. There was also Hitler’s personal prestige in the Arab world as the leader of the struggle against the Jews: ‘In Islam, the Fuhrer already hold a pre-eminent position because of his fight against Judaism.’ (As he does to this day.) To exploit these advantages and opportunities, von Stohrer proposed the development of an ‘extensive Islamic programme’. This came to fruition when the German Foreign Ministry relaunched the hitherto defunct Berlin Islamic Central Institute,

staffed by prominent lay and clerical Muslims then resident in Germany. Closely supervised by Nazi officialdom, its allotted task was the promotion of Germany's war aims in the Islamic world, of which one, as the Mufti soon became well aware, much to his satisfaction, was the extermination of the Jews.

It did not take long for the Mufti and Hitler to get down to business. Following the Mufti's arrival in Berlin, Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop arranged the audience with Hitler which took place on November 28. As we have already seen, the official protocol (for the full text, see Appendix S) records Hitler pledging to the Mufti that once his armies had broken through into the Middle East they, together with forces commanded by the Mufti, would set about 'the destruction of the Jewish element residing in the Arab sphere under the protection of British power.' Germany, said Hitler, 'stood for uncompromising war against the Jews. That naturally included active opposition to the Jewish national home in Palestine, which was nothing other than a centre in the form of a state, for the exercise of destructive influence by Jewish interests.' (This allegation was identical to that made by Hitler in the quote from *Mein Kampf* posted on the website of Palestine Live Administrator and close friend of fellow member Corbyn, Elleanne Green. See Appendix T) Hitler promised al-Husseini that once the Germany army had evicted the British from the Mandate, 'the Jews are yours'. A strange way to go about creating a Jewish state in Palestine, as alleged by Livingstone.

According to the Mufti's own record of the meeting, Hitler had explained that although it was true that 'our common enemies are Great Britain and the Soviets', behind them stood 'hidden Jewry which drives them both'. Germany's victory in this confrontation would therefore be 'of great and positive help to the Arabs who are engaged in the same struggle.' This 'same struggle' was a war that could not be won without the extermination of the Jews. And 'only if we win the war will the hour of deliverance also be the hour of fulfilment of Arab aspirations.' The Mufti's hopes therefore rested entirely not only on Hitler's victory in the war against the Allies, but the annihilation of the hidden force both believed stood behind and guided their military enemies. The goal of the extermination of the Jews therefore became the common foundation of the Mufti's alliance with the Third Reich. But not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC.

In the days and weeks that followed this meeting, there was set in motion a chain of decisions and events that led to what in official Nazi parlance was referred to as 'the final solution of the Jewish question'. Having committed himself to the Arab, and specifically the Palestinian cause, Hitler had to ensure that no more Jews could seek refuge from Nazi persecution in the Middle East. Already, on March 11, 1941, Hitler had given an undertaking to al-Husseini that Germany would bloc all Jewish emigration from Europe. (Also seeking to placate the Arabs, Britain was following a similar policy. See Addendum to Appendix A) Therefore, if Europe was to be made 'Jew free' as Hitler intended, that left only one alternative - extermination. Within hours of his meeting with the Mufti, he instructed Reinhard Heydrich, Himmler's second in command, to convene a conference that would make practical arrangements for the implementation of the 'final solution of the Jewish question'. The next day, November 29, Heydrich sent out invitations to thirteen high-ranking Nazi officials to meet on December 9 in the Berlin suburb of Wannsee. The conference had to be postponed when, on December 7, Japan attacked the US naval base at Pearl Harbour. As befitted his strategic role in the impending Holocaust of the Jews, on December 9, the Mufti was accorded VIP status, with the photo of his

encounter with Hitler featured in the Nazi press, and an invitation to attend as a guest of honour an emergency session of the Reichstag, where Hitler was to announce his decision to join Japan in its war against the United States. In the course of his speech, Hitler boasted that while Britain now had the decadent, materialist, mongrel Americans on their side, Germany, as a result of his alliance with the Mufti, had a warrior race, the pure-blooded Arabs.

The postponed Wannsee conference took place on January 20, 1942, where it was decided, in the words of one of those present, Adolf Eichmann, to implement 'the biological extermination of the Jewish race'. On April 28, 1942, al-Husseini received from the Nazi Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop what was obviously intended to be understood as an official confirmation of undertakings made verbally by Hitler to the Mufti at their meeting in Berlin on November 28. It concluded with the pledge that the Third Reich was 'ready to give all her support to the oppressed Arab countries in their fight against British domination, for the fulfilment of their national aim to independence and sovereignty and for the destruction of the Jewish National Home in Palestine.' (The exact reverse of what Livingstone had claimed was Hitler's policy.) This communication, which, Ribbentrop requested 'should be maintained absolutely secret until we decide otherwise', left no room for any doubt as to what was to be the fate of the Jews of Palestine. The Mufti must have known exactly what Hitler was proposing, and the part he was expected, and as we shall, was only too willing to play in it... the extermination of all the Jews in the Middle East. Proof of this was not long in coming. As result of his meeting with Hitler, an agreement followed with the Third Reich that provided the Mufti with a radio station to broadcast pro-Nazi and anti-Jewish propaganda to the Middle East, and a promise to exterminate the Jews when the *Wehrmacht* fought its way into the areas of Jewish settlement in the British Mandate. The Mufti's part in this operation was to prepare and then mobilise Muslim support for the Nazis' extermination programme in the Mufti's main power base, the strategically located British Mandate. But the Mufti's potential usefulness to the Nazis reached far beyond Palestine. He was also President of the forerunner of today's Organisation of the Islamic Conference, the World Islamic Congress, a post of considerable prestige and influence, if not actual power, in the wider world of Islam. Hence his importance to Nazi objectives in a double sense, and why he lacked for nothing in pursuit of his several endeavours.

Even before the war and his arrival in Berlin, the Mufti had been channelling Nazi subsidies in foreign currency to his political and religious co-thinkers, including more than a hundred Muslim students in Paris and the Muslim Brotherhood in the Middle East the theocratic movement that gave birth to Corbyn's 'friends' Hamas in 1987. Having secured the patronage of Hitler, the cash flow, already substantial, increased to a flood. In addition to his radio station and the Berlin-based Islamic Central Institute (see below), the Nazi regime funded a personal staff of 60 officials, of whom the 23 most important received salaries of between 200 and 700 Reichsmarks per month. As to his personal needs, the Mufti wanted for nothing. His personal salary amounted to an incredible 90,000 Reichsmarks per month. He was housed on Berlin's fashionable Klopstock Strasse, in a mansion that had once been, in what was one history's most perverse ironies, a Zionist Hebrew School. Al Husseini referred to it as his 'Research Institute on the Jewish Problem in the Muslim World'. As was (and still is) customary, the traditional Arab Muslim clan nepotism played its part in staffing policy, with at least

three nephews of the Mufti, and possibly several more, being placed on the pay roll. In addition to the Nazi funding of al-Husseini's various propaganda operations, in February 1943 Hitler personally authorised the creation of a Swiss bank account in the Mufti's name, together with a gift of shares in a number of German firms, amounting in all to the value of 18.4 million Reich marks. Hitler's designated successor, Hermann Goering, acted as trustee for both investments. There is no record of any other Nazi collaborator being similarly favoured...or trusted. According to Fritz Grobba, who as a specialist on the Middle East, attended the al-Hussain-Hitler meeting, the Mufti 'enjoyed the special trust of the German political and military offices because of the clerical vestments he wore'.

Although generously equipped with the means to play his chosen role in the 'final solution', the Mufti realised that everything now hinged on the success of Hitler's military operations in North Africa. As the Axis forces crossed the border into Egypt for the final push to Cairo and the Suez Canal, al-Husseini upped his game, now seeking to play an active military role in the Nazi-Muslim alliance he had helped to forge. As Rommel's tanks rolled eastwards deep into Egypt, on July 26, 1942, al-Husseini wrote to von Ribbentrop proposing the formation of a Palestinian commando force to operate behind enemy lines. Hitler approved the plan, but too late to have any effect on what proved to be the decisive battle that was looming at el-Alamein, where the British Eighth Army had made its last stand. Rommel's offensive stalled, and then his army driven back into Libya. The British victory at El Alamein was not only a strategic defeat for Hitler, but no less so for the Mufti, whose political ambitions and hopes for a Middle Eastern Holocaust had always been totally dependent on Nazi military supremacy. Even so, having cast his lot in with the Nazis, there was no turning back. The prophet's official birthday of March 19 is a very special day in the Muslim calendar, and in 1943, with the war now running against the Axis powers on all fronts, in a radio broadcast to the Muslim world, al-Husseini used the anniversary to re-dedicate his followers to what was now a doomed Nazi cause:

Arabs and Muslims, on this occasion of the birthday of the prophet, who crushed Jewish ambitions in the past and completely eliminated them from Muslim countries, thereby setting us an example; on such a day Muslims and Arabs should vow before God utterly to crush Jewish ambitions and prove that God is greater than imperialism [sic] and far more powerful than the devilry which surrounds international Judaism.

Maybe the war against the Allies was lost, but the war against the Jews had to continue. In November 1943, fully aware that the Holocaust was now running at full throttle, the Mufti called on Muslims and Arabs to continue to play their part in the liquidation of the Jews:

It is the duty of all Muhammadans and Arabs in particular to drive all Jews from Arab and Muhammadan countries. Germany is also struggling against the common foe that oppressed Arabs and Muhammadans in their different countries. It has very clearly recognised the Jews for what they are and resolved to find a definite solution [sic] for the Jewish danger that will eliminate the scourge that Jews represent in the world.

There was also another memorable date in the Muslim calendar, only it was one for commemorating with much cursing and gnashing of teeth. On November 2, 1917, the British Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour, issued the promise that his

government would do what it could to secure 'a national home for the Jewish people' in Palestine. Even though this was not a commitment to the establishment of a Jewish state, successive British governments nevertheless reneged on the pledge when it became evident that its implementation would be at the cost of permanently damaging Britain's relations with the Arab leaders and peoples of what was for the British Empire a highly strategic and militarily vulnerable region. Even though by 1943, the Balfour Declaration had long been a dead letter, both al-Husseini and his Nazi patrons saw its anniversary as an opportunity to drum up support amongst the Arabs of the Middle East for a Third Reich whose armies were everywhere in headlong retreat. A huge rally to mark the occasion was staged in the vast main hall of the *Luftwaffe* headquarters in Berlin with 20 VIPs in attendance.

The proceedings were broadcast on German radio, with a commentator setting the scene: 'We are in the *Luftwaffe* building in Berlin, where Arab leaders are gathered to protest against the Balfour Declaration. The hall is festooned with Arab flags and portraits of Arab patriots. Arabs and Muslims from every land pour into the hall. Among them are Moroccans, Palestinians, Lebanese, Yemenites, men from the Hejaz, [Saudi Arabia] Indians, Iranians and Muslim representatives from all over Europe.' Also present were 'a great many Germans friendly to the Arabs, high government officials, civilian and military, one of the SS chiefs, representatives of foreign embassies and at their head representatives of the Japanese Embassy. The audience runs into hundreds.' Then the great moment arrived. The stage was set for the entry of the future founder of the Arab League and the Organisation of the Islamic Conference: 'Now I see the Mufti of Jerusalem making his way into the hall. He is shaking hands with a number of notables [sic] and mounts the steps to deliver his address.' The Mufti's speech emphasised not only the common interests that had drawn Muslims and Nazis together, but the durability of the alliance these shared goals had generated. He also, *inter alia*, let it be known that he was fully appraised and approved of what was by this time the well-advanced Nazi operation to exterminate the Jews of Europe:

...the Germans know how to get rid of the Jews. That which brings us close to the Germans and sets us in their camp is that up to today, the Germans have never harmed any Muslim, and they are again fighting our common enemy. (Applause) But most of all because they have definitely solved the Jewish problem. These ties, and especially the last, make our friendship with Germany not a provisional one, dependent on conditions, but a permanent and lasting friendship based on mutual interest.

Not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC. Unable to be present at the event, Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop sent a telegram to the Mufti emphasising as on previous occasions the Third Reich's commitment to cleansing the Middle East of its Jews:

I send you greetings to you and the Assembly gathered under your chairmanship in the capital of the German Reich. Old ties of friendship bind Germany to the Arab people. Today more than any other period she is your natural ally. The obliteration of what is called the Jewish National Home and the liberation of the Arab peoples from persecution and exploitation by foreigners is a basic tenet of German policy. The hour approaches when the Arab people will once again build their future in freedom.

SS chief Heinrich Himmler was also too busy to attend, engaged as he was in overseeing the extermination of the Jews of Europe. He did, however, find the time to add his own greetings to those of Ribbentrop:

The National Socialist Party of Germany has inscribed on its flag; the extermination [n.b.] of world Jewry. Our Party sympathises with the fight of the Arabs, especially the Arabs of Palestine, against the foreign Jew. Today, on this Memorial Day of the Balfour declaration, I send my greetings and wishes for success in our fight. [signed] Heinrich Himmler, Leader of SS.

Statements such as these are not easily reconciled with Livingstone's claim that Hitler intended to impose a Zionist state on the Palestinians. But they are with the objectives of Corbyn's 'friend's.

As the war began to turn against Germany, so the Mufti's influence among the Nazi tops rose. Emulating the Kaiser's pro-Islamic strategy of the First World War, when he sanctioned the construction in Berlin of Germany's first mosque, the Nazis approved the establishment in Berlin of the Islamic Central Institute, officially opened by the Mufti on December 18, 1942, the date chosen being that of the pilgrimage feast of '*Id al-Adha*, the 'Feast of the Sacrifice'. The Institute was largely the brainchild of Propaganda Minister Goebbels, who like other top Nazi leaders, most notably Himmler and Hitler, saw Islam as a natural and valuable ally in the war against the Jews and the Allies. On the occasion of the Institute's opening, al-Husseini sent a telegram to Hitler, thanking him for his support for the new venture. Hitler's reply was broadcast in Arabic on January 3, 1943: 'To the Great Leader, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, I present to you my thanks for your kind telegram and wish you complete success in your participation in the tasks of the future',

The Mufti's address at the Institute's opening, also broadcast to the Arab world, gave more than a hint of what these 'tasks of the future' might be:

Among the most bitter enemies of the Muslims are the Jews and their accomplices. The holy *Koran* and the history of the Prophet are full of evidence of the Jewish lack of character and their malicious, mendacious and treacherous behaviour, which completely suffices to warn Muslims of their ever-constant, severe threat and enmity until the end of all days. And as the Jews were in the lifetime of the great Prophet, so they have remained throughout all ages conniving and full of hatred toward the Muslim, wherever an opportunity offered itself to them.

The speech, which the Mufti ended with the salutation, 'there is no God but Allah', was a great success. It was broadcast to North Africa and the Middle East, and even published in the official Nazi daily, the *Völkischer Beobachter*, together with a full report of the ceremony and an article titled 'This War Could Bring Freedom to Islam'. Financed by the Third Reich's Foreign Office, the Institute's staff were all Muslims drawn from a wide range of Islamic countries. The Mufti's role at the Institute was not only to pump Islamic 'hate speech' and well-funded pro-Nazi propaganda into the Arab and Islamic worlds. Hitler even went so far as to authorise the formation of an all-Muslim Waffen SS division in Bosnia, the *Handschar*, to combat Tito's communist partisans, and to round up 50,000 Jews destined for extermination in the death camps of Poland. Awarded by the Mufti the

title 'The Cream of Islam', ('dregs' more readily comes to mind) the division's flag symbolised the fusion of the faith with Nazism, with its emblem of a swastika and a sword. And in a rare example of harmonious 'interfaith dialogue', fighting alongside the Mufti's Muslim warriors against the same enemies were units of the Vatican-sponsored Croatian Catholic militia, the fascist Ustashi. One of their clerical leaders (among them members of the Jesuit and Franciscan Orders) said with the same justice as the Mufti did of his own battalions, that they were 'Germany's natural friends because they had the same enemies, namely the English, the Jews and the communists'.

SS chief Heinrich Himmler went to inordinate lengths to ensure that his Slav Jihadis were made to feel at home in the company of their Aryan fellow Jew-killers. He issued instructions that they be treated with what today would be termed the utmost 'cultural sensitivity', with special provision being made for their dietary requirements. It would appear that Himmler's multi-culturalism did not sit easily with all the German SS officers commanding the Muslim division. Evidently, they were in urgent need of a crash course in 'diversity awareness' and 'inclusivity', because on August 6, 1943, Himmler found it necessary to issue the following reprimand: 'I hold all commanders and other SS officers responsible for the most scrupulous and loyal respect for this privilege especially granted to the Muslims. They have answered the call of the Muslim chiefs and have come to us out of hatred for the common Jewish Anglo-Bolshevik enemy through [their] respect and fidelity for he who they respect above all, the *Fuehrer* Adolf Hitler. There will no longer be the least discussion about the special rights allowed to the Muslims in these circles. Heil Hitler!' Islamophobia was *verboten*.

The guidelines issued for German personnel in their dealings with the local Muslim populations in North Africa and the Soviet Union were indeed a model of cultural sensitivity. The same armed units that either killed Jews on the spot or despatched them to gas chambers in Poland were instructed to treat any Muslims they encountered with the utmost civility and respect. The same regime that in the 'Crystal Night' of November 1938 vandalised, looted and destroyed scores of German synagogues now, in the Crimea and the Caucasus, reopened and restored mosques that had been closed by the Soviet authorities or damaged in the fighting. No doubt grateful to be back in business, in return, imams said prayers for Hitler, called for a holy war on Jewish Bolshevism, and for Muslims to enrol in the German army. Printed instructions issued to *Wehrmacht* servicemen, who had hitherto been allowed to rape whoever they fancied, demanded that they show respect for 'the honour of Muslim women.' 'Religion and religious customs and conventions of the Caucasians', unlike those of the Jews, had to be 'respected and not ridiculed, even though they may appear odd.'

General Ewald von Kleist, commander of German forces in the Caucasus, explained to his fellow officers the geopolitical motive for a policy that was not usually associated with an invading Nazi army, especially in the East: 'We stand at the gates to the Islamic world. What we do and how we behave here will radiate deep into Iraq, to India, as far as the borders of China.' Nazi multi-culturalism and inclusivity went far beyond showing 'respect'. Increasing numbers of Muslims were actually being enrolled in the ranks of the Nazi war machine, both in the Soviet Union and the Balkans. In the Spring of 1943, the Mufti toured the latter region to drum up Muslim support for the Nazi campaign against Tito's partisans. When he returned a year later to boost the morale of his Muslim Waffen SS recruits, he was

captured on camera for posterity giving a Nazi salute while inspecting the *Handschar* Division. Evidently impressed with the military bearing of Hitler's Jihadis, he praised them as 'an example to all Muslims in all countries', and for making common cause with Germany, 'the only great power that has never attacked an Islamic country'. Moreover, there were, said the Mufti, 'also considerable similarities between Islamic principles and those of National Socialism'. But not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC...or the *dhimmi* left for that matter.

The Mufti was only one, but certainly the most important, of a large team of Muslim clerics and political leaders recruited by the Nazis to further their geopolitical objectives in the Islamic world. Imam Alimjan Idris from Turkistan was hired by the Third Reich Foreign Ministry as early as 1933 as an adviser on Islamic affairs, specialising, as one would expect, in anti-Jewish propaganda. On the outbreak of the Second World War, he transferred to the Orient section of German foreign broadcasting, which involved collaboration with the Propaganda Ministry of Josef Goebbels, another admirer of the Mufti. An able linguist, one of his duties was to translate Hitler's *Mein Kampf* into Persian. Amongst other Muslims who offered their services to the Nazis were two Arabs, 'Abd al-Halim al-Naggar and Muhammad Safty, who in December 1942, became the Director of the newly opened, Berlin-based Islamic Central Institute. However it was the *Wehrmacht* and Waffen SS who were the most interested in the Muslim connection, chiefly because they saw in the Arabs and other Islamic peoples a huge source of recruitment to the Third Reich's overstretched and progressively depleted armed forces. In the 'Desert War' of North Africa, Arab Muslims served mainly as auxiliaries to the Axis armies, but in the East, captured Red Army Muslims were recruited in large numbers to form *Ostlegionen*, Eastern Legions, which were then thoughtfully provided with field imams trained in Dresden and at the University of Gottingen. Such was the demand for Muslim clergy that another school for imams serving in the Balkans was opened personally by al-Husseini, on April 21, 1944, with an all-Muslim staff of four Bosnian clerics. It turned out fifty SS imams on two courses lasting two months each. By the end of 1942, 53,000 Muslims were under arms on the Eastern front, fighting for Allah and Hitler's Reich. So, in the East, against the USSR, in North Africa against the British, and as we have already seen, in the Balkans against Tito's communist partisans, large numbers of Muslims, with the approval and encouragement of their clergy, were willingly making common cause with the Axis powers in their wars of conquest and extermination. But not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC.

Concerned not to offend their Islamic allies, who hailed from a wide variety of ethnic groupings, the Nazis went out of their way to reassure them that the Third Reich's racial laws and doctrine did not consign Arabs, Turks and Persians to the same sub-human status as Jews. Indeed, as early as 1935, at a time when the Nazi's Islamic orientation was still in its infancy, Goebbels' Propaganda Ministry issued instructions to the press that because the Arabs were generally regarded as Semitic peoples, the press must stop using the term 'anti-Semitism' and to use instead the term 'anti-Jewish'. Academics were allotted the task of providing a scientific foundation for a racial distinction that was central to Nazi strategy in the Middle East, where vital British interests and lines of communication were most vulnerable to attack. The care taken to avoid offending Arab sensitivities on this question was well illustrated in an exchange between Rashid Ali al-Kailani, the pro-Nazi Prime Minister of Iraq deposed by the British in May 1941, and Professor Walter Gross,

Director of the Racial Office of the Nazi Party. After his overthrow and flight to exile in Berlin, Ali wrote to Professor Gross that in view of the fact that 'in their struggle for freedom and their rights they [the Arabs] had so much support from the Germans', his Nazi patrons should dispel any confusion on this issue 'by presenting the truth about the German attitude towards the Arab race'. Professor Gross agreed. Unlike the Jews, a 'disharmonious race mixture', the 'Semitic-Arab peoples, languages and cultures always were the object of affectionate interest on the part of German scholarship'. There was no question of the Nazis ranking the Arabs on the same sub-human level as the Jews:

No responsible person or institution in Germany ever said that the Arabs were racially inferior or stood on an unfavourable place in the rank of human races. On the contrary, National Socialist racial theory considers the Arabs members of a higher human race that looks back on a glorious and heroic history. That is why, too, the struggle of the Arabs for political liberation against the Jewish usurpation of Palestine has always been observed and supported by Germany with particular sympathy.

'...the Jewish usurpation of Palestine...' Haven't we heard that before somewhere? As early as 1935, aware of the offence Nazi racial classifications might give to potential allies in Iran and Turkey, Goebbels's Propaganda Ministry banned the use in the media of the term anti-Semitism and its cognates, and, as do wokistas today, in the same spirit, described criticism of Islam as 'undesirable'. Other Muslim peoples also gained from this racial upgrading. By 1942, Caucasian Muslims had even been elevated to the status of quasi-Aryans and were now described as 'Indo-Germans'. Even Slavs, hitherto regarded and treated as '*untermenschen*', could find themselves promoted into the human race, so long as they were Muslims, which in the Balkans, many were, 50,000 of whom provided recruits for the Waffen SS's anti-partisan Muslim *Handschar* Division.

The Mufti's was not the only Islamic game in town, though it was certainly the one with the highest profile and most resources. Aside from the Mufti, there was, as we have already seen, Rashid Ali al-Kailani, a refugee from his failed pro-Axis coup in Iraq in May 1941. al-Kailani can be seen in a photograph shaking hands with Hitler during a visit to the Nazi leader's war headquarters at Rastenburg in East Prussia on July 15, 1942, a sure indication that like the Mufti, he had been admitted to the inner circle of those Muslims with and through whom the Nazis hoped to advance their geo-political ambitions in the Arab and, more broadly, the Islamic world. Aside from this 'photo opportunity' (the Mufti also featured in one with Hitler at their meeting of November 28, 1941, and another with Himmler in July 1943), there was a highly sinister aspect to al-Kailani's elevation. A month earlier, he, together with three other Muslims whose identities are not certain (though one could have been the Mufti) visited Sachsenhausen concentration camp, where experiments were being conducted to discover the most efficient means of killing Jews. By the time of their visit, gassing had already been chosen as the most effective and cheapest method of implementing the 'final solution of the Jewish question' that had been agreed at the Wannsee Conference in Berlin on January 20, 1942. Previously, in January 1941, that is, before his arrival in Germany in November of the same year, the Mufti had written to Hitler asking him to help solve the 'Jewish question' in the Middle East. Now Muslim leaders from the Middle East were being shown just how it could and was being done. Whether he visited

Sachsenhausen or not, the Mufti was certainly kept fully 'in the loop' as to the preparation and progress of the Holocaust. Despite the high level of secrecy surrounding the Wannsee Conference, following his meeting and agreement with Hitler a week previously, on December 4, 1941, the Mufti was awarded the extraordinary privilege of an advanced briefing as to the conference's purpose and subject matter by none other than Adolf Eichmann, even being allowed into the map room of Reich Main Security Office Jewish Affairs Division to have it explained just where Europe's Jews were located and how they would be rounded up and processed.

The day following the Wannsee Conference, the gathering that sealed the fate of two thirds of Europe's Jews, the Mufti received another briefing on its results, which included a statistical summary prepared by Adolf Eichmann of the Jewish populations of all the European states. All were scheduled for extermination. The problem for al-Husseini was that the list did not include Jews living in the Middle East. Concerned to ensure that, as he had already requested of Hitler, Middle Eastern Jews would not be excluded from the extermination programme agreed at Wannsee, the Mufti asked for a written assurance that this was indeed the case. Sure enough, on April 28, 1942, Hitler's government sent letters to the Mufti and al-Kailani undertaking to exterminate all the Jews living in the Palestine Mandate and Iraq. Hitler even repeated this pledge personally to al-Kailani when they met at his Eastern front headquarters on July 15, 1942. But not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC.

The lengths the Nazi leadership were prepared to go to promote the reputation and importance of al-Husseini were quite extraordinary, exceeding by far any extended to other collaborators. The periodical *Die Aktion*, in its issue of March 1942, published a lengthy interview with al-Husseini titled 'An Hour with the "Faithful": His eminence the Grand Mufti speaks about the Arab national aims.' This was followed a year later by a whole book devoted to al-Husseini, *Amin al-Husseini, Grossmufti von Palestine* (sic: not 'Jerusalem'); and in the same year, an invitation to the Mufti to write a Preface to a Nazi source book on British policy in the Palestine Mandate by another Muslim collaborator, Mamun al-Hamui, with the title *Die britische Palestina-Politik, Dokumente zur Zeitgeschichte*.

There was also a very practical aspect to the Mufti's collaborationist activities that went far beyond the literary and propagandistic. There is weighty evidence that the Mufti accompanied Eichmann on visits to the Auschwitz and Maidanek death camps in the summer of 1943. According to the testimony at the Nuremberg Trials of Himmler's Deputy, Dieter Wisliceny, the Mufti 'was one of the initiators of the systematic extermination of European Jewry and had been a collaborator and adviser of Eichmann and Himmler in the execution of this plan...He was one of Eichmann's best friends and had constantly incited him to accelerate the extermination measures. I heard him say that accompanied by Eichmann, he had visited incognito the gas chambers of Auschwitz.' Not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC. What is certain is that the Mufti selected three Iraqi Muslims, Naji Shaukat, Mohammed Hasan Salman and Kamil al-Kailani, to supervise the projected extermination of the Jews in the Middle East. In his memoirs, al-Husseini related that he had even selected a location close to the town of Nablus, (in what is now the West Bank) where, upon the eagerly anticipated arrival of the Nazis, he intended to establish a facility for this purpose. What is also not in doubt is the Mufti's three-day stay in Frankfurt, starting on April 12, 1943, as the guest of Alfred

Rosenberg, the Nazi ideologue and head of the Nazi's Institute for Research into the Jewish Question based in that city. Founded in 1939, the Institute employed 70 researchers and 600 other staff. Its central tasks were devising the ideological and pseudo-scientific justifications for the impending extermination of the Jews, and planning the vast movement of peoples and deployment of resources necessary for its execution.

In March 1941, with military preparations nearing completion for the invasion of the Soviet Union and the slaughter of its Jews, the Institute hosted a conference of academics on the theme, 'The Universal European Solution of the Jewish Question'. Papers were given by specialists in various aspects of this so-called 'Jewish Question', all of them with one purpose, which over the next three years culminated in this question's 'final solution' by either slave labour, shooting or gassing. al-Husseini did not attend this conference, as he only arrived in Germany in November of the same year. But he was invited to attend a second conference convened, on Hitler's express command, by Rosenberg's Institute and scheduled to be held in Krakow in the summer of 1944. Billed as an International Anti-Jewish Congress, the delegates were headed by top Nazi brass: Hitler's private secretary and head of the Fuehrer's Chancellery, Martin Bormann, Governor of Poland Hans Frank, Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels, SS chief Heinrich Himmler, Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop and Labour Front boss Robert Ley, together with a large entourage of quisling politicians and academics (including Vidkund Quisling himself) from Nazi occupied countries, and Nazi sympathisers from Spain, Sweden, Egypt and Switzerland. From among the delegates, twelve had been chosen to present papers to the congress, the theme of each being the need to enrol all the anti-Semites of Europe and beyond in a final settling of accounts with the Jews. One of those so honoured was none other than Haj Amin al-Husseini, who was selected to deliver a paper titled, 'Palestine, A World Political Pivot of the Jewish Drive for Power'. Sadly for the Mufti, the opportunity to impress his Nazi patrons with a virtuoso unmasking of the World Jewish Conspiracy and as central to it, Zionist intrigues in Palestine, was frustrated by the rapid advance of the Jewish Bolshevik Red Army into Poland, and in the west, the Jewish plutocratic allied landings in Normandy. After several postponements, the congress was cancelled.

The theme chosen by al-Husseini, or possibly chosen for him by the congress organisers, had become of special concern to Goebbels, since he had received an eleven-page memorandum in March the same year, drafted by *Oberstleutnant* Wolf Meyer-Christian, the author of a book on the 'Anglo-Jewish alliance'. Like Hitler and al-Husseini, Meyer-Christian, as Max Weinreich puts it, not only believed that 'Zionism was the most menacing of all Jewish movements' but that 'the Jewish Agency for Palestine in effect was a world Jewish government striving for world domination'...exactly the claim advanced by Hitler in *Mein Kampf*, by Corbyn's Hamas 'friends' in their Covenant...and endorsed by Palestine Live Administrator and Jeremy Corbyn's close friend, Elleanne Green. Over the next six months, Goebbels' own news agency, *Deutscher Wochendienst*, then recycled this material for featuring in the Nazi press. Since, like Meyer-Christian, not only Hitler and Goebbels, but the entire Nazi leadership undoubtedly believed Zionism to be 'the most menacing of all Jewish movements', this conviction explains the prominent position al-Husseini occupied in the hierarchy of Nazi collaborators and quislings, as it does the intended participation of the Mufti in the Congress as not only a delegate but as a speaker, proof that unlike some Nazi stooges, French quisling

Pierre Laval for example, his alliance with the Nazis was for real, being grounded on a shared loathing for the Jews. Since the early 1920s, al-Husseini had been composing his own anti-Semitic, Arab nationalist melodies, and he had no intention of dancing to anybody else's when he threw in his lot with Hitler in November 1941. Neither did his Nazi patrons need him to. What was consummated in the Mufti's first meeting with Hitler was not a simulated conversion to Nazi racism, but *convergence*. The war, and the Holocaust, found them standing on common ground. And it was not only al-Husseini who believed he had a mandate from heaven to rid the world of its Jews. So did Hitler, as he proclaimed in *Mein Kampf*: 'By defending [sic] myself against the Jews, I am fighting for the work of the Lord'. So it is easy to see why all Nazi doors were opened wide for Hitler's partner in a divinely-sanctioned genocide.

For example, impressed with the 'work' of the Frankfurt Institute after his visit in April 1943, al-Husseini requested, and was granted, funds to establish a similar institute of his own in Berlin, with the same genocidal objectives in mind for the Middle East. That is why he seconded one of his own staff, the Syrian Adil Maski, to work alongside Rosenberg in Frankfurt to gain experience for the new undertaking in Berlin. While in Frankfurt, Maski translated into Arabic the Institute's fortnightly journal, *Weltkampf: Die Judenfrage in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Battle for the World: The Jewish Question Past and Present), wherein the need for and means to solve this 'question' were quite openly promoted. Never wanting for funds, the Mufti did not confine his activities to this and other enterprises in Berlin. He gave instruction classes to Muslim SS officers serving in Yugoslavia at Zagreb and Banja Luka, and to SS imams (sic) at Potsdam.

On July 4, 1943, by which time the Final Solution was in full swing, the Imam met its principal architect and organiser, Heinrich Himmler, in the Ukrainian village of Zhitomir, just east of Kiev, which in September 1941 had been the scene of the massacre of some 33,000 Jews. Here too, a Muslim meets Nazi photo opportunity presented itself, and gave to posterity a record of two monumentally criminal anti-Semites smiling as they shook hands. During his stay in Zhitomir, the Mufti dined with several other guests, these being the Waffen SS generals Berger, von Scholz, Brandt and Best. In addition to rounding up and slaughtering Jews behind the Eastern front, Brandt's other special interest was the selecting and killing of Jews to create a collection of skeletons for 'research' purposes. It was in this convivial setting that, according to his memoirs, the Mufti was informed by Himmler how many Jews his murder machine had exterminated: '...we have decided in this war to make them suffer and to pay attention to their activities in advance. Thus, up to now, we have liquidated about three million of them.' That number was about right.

Three months later, on October 6, Himmler announced to a meeting of Nazi officials in Posen (now Poznan) that 'this people [the Jews] must disappear from the face of the earth.' Such was the company kept by the liberator of the Palestinians and holy man from Jerusalem...and Yasser Arafat's 'hero'. But what of the Mufti's own plan for a Muslim 'final solution'? Had not Hitler promised him at their first encounter in Berlin that the Jews of the Middle East were 'all yours'? With the arrival of the Nazi armed forces in North Africa in March 1941 to bolster Fascist Italy's feeble efforts to defeat the British, it seemed the opportunity had arrived. Already, both the Vichy French in Tunisia and the Italians in Libya had been rounding up Jews and interning them. With arrival in North Africa in June 1942 of Walther Rauff, the pioneer of the mobile gas extermination van, the final stage was

set to begin. All told, some 5,000 Jews were put to death, the killing only stopping when, with Rommel's troops on the run after their defeat at el-Alamein, the Germans had other things on their minds than Jew-killing. Even so, Rauff's mini-pogrom in North Africa gave more than hint of the fate that would have befallen the Jews of the Mandate had the *Wehrmacht*, as the Mufti and his colleagues hoped, broken through the British lines and crossed the Suez Canal. In the expectation of just such a Middle Eastern 'final solution', co-incidental with the German advance towards Cairo, on July 7, 1942, Berlin Radio's 'Voice of the Free Arabs' broadcast a call to 'kill the Jews before they kill you':

Kill the Jews who took your valuables, Arabs of Syria, Iraq and Palestine. What are you waiting for? According to Islam it is a duty to defend yourselves. This can only be fulfilled by the liquidation of the Jews. This is your best chance to get rid of this dirty race. Kill the Jews! Set their possessions on fire! Demolish their shops! Liquidate those evil helpers of British imperialism! Your only hope for rescue is to annihilate the Jews before they do this to you.

There is little doubt that had the Germans reached Cairo and beyond, many Muslims would have then shown their hand, rallying to the call from the Mufti in Berlin that a Jihadi alliance with Nazi Germany was the only means by which the Arabs could liberate themselves from British rule and settle their accounts with the Jews. Historians of these events have recorded there was an undisguised admiration for Islam's war-like temper amongst the top Nazi leadership. SS chief and Holocaust architect Heinrich Himmler, who kept a copy of the *Koran* at his bedside, waxed the most lyrical about the warrior spirit of Muslims, and especially the cunning of their prophet:

Mohammed knew that most people are terribly cowardly and stupid. That is why he promised every warrior who fights courageously and falls in battle two [sic] beautiful women. This is the kind of language a soldier understands. When he believes that he will be welcome in this manner in the afterlife, he will be willing to give his life, he will be enthusiastic about going into battle and not fear death.

While Himmler was somewhat parsimonious in his computation of the rewards for martyrdom, he undeniably grasped the essential principles of Islamic *Jihad*. In the course of his many dealings with Himmler, the Mufti came to appreciate what he described as his 'intelligence, cunning and breadth of knowledge'. According to Felix Kersten, Himmler's doctor, the SS chief had been introduced to Islam by another top Nazi devotee of the faith, Hitler's deputy, the Egyptian-born Rudolf Hess. (First published in German in 1947, the 1992 English language edition of Kersten's memoirs omitted, without any acknowledgement or explanation, the chapter devoted to Himmler's eulogy of Islam. I do not need an explanation.) As for Hitler, there are several accounts of his views on the merits of Islam, each of them very much in same spirit as those of Himmler. The Islamic 'exhortation to fight courageously' succeeded because 'as a corollary, the Muslims were promised a paradise peopled with houris, where wine flowed in streams - a real earthly paradise'. These lavish rewards for Muslims Hitler contrasted with those for Christians, who 'declare themselves satisfied if after death they allowed to sing Hallelujahs'. Such was Hitler's admiration for the martial qualities of Islam that on more than one occasion, he expressed his regret that the Christian powers had

frustrated the attempted Muslim conquest of Europe, as here, to his Arms Production Minister, Albert Speer:

You see, it's been our misfortune to have the wrong religion. The Mohammedan religion would have been much more compatible with us than Christianity. Why did it have to be Christianity with its meekness and flabbiness?... Islamised Germans could have stood at the head of this Mohammedan Empire.

Some Nazis became so enamoured of Islam that after the war, with their dream of a thousand-year Reich shattered, and with the Muslim world now on the rise and in the Middle East, seething with anti-Semitism, they took the final and logical step of converting. Two in particular who did so are worthy of mention; the propagandist Johann von Leers and the racial theorist Ferdinand Clauss. von Leers was a top-ranking journalist for the even by Nazi standards obsessively anti-Semitic and pornographic *Dur Sturmer* of Julius Streicher. As such, he naturally praised the prophet for his success in combating the Jewish peril:

Unquestionably, one result of Mohammed's hostility towards the Jews was that oriental Jewry was completely paralysed by Islam. If the rest of the world had adopted a similar approach, we would not have a Jewish question today...Islam has made an eternal service to the world by preventing the conquest of Arabia by the Jew.

But not according to the Secretary-General of the OIC. Like so many Nazis on the run from Allied justice, von Leers fled to Egypt, where, on converting, he assumed the name Omar Amin von Leers. With an impeccably anti-Jewish c.v. such as his, it was only to be expected that President Nasser would later hire von Leers as his chief propaganda adviser and press officer. In the racist ramblings of Ferdinand Clauss, there also appears frequently an insistence on 'points of contact' and an 'ideological proximity' between Islam and National Socialism. (But not according to etc.) He too converted to Islam after the war. Other fugitive Nazi converts to Islam included Leopold Gleim, head of the Gestapo in Poland, who took the Muslim name of Ali al-Nahar and also entered the service of President Nasser, and Erich Altern, who after implementing the 'final solution' in Galicia, as Ali Bella, continued his crusade against the Jews by training Palestinian terrorists in Egypt. Then we have two SS officers; Wilhelm Boekler, who after converting to Islam as Abd al Karim, took charge of another terrorist training camp in Egypt, and Alois Moser, aka Hassan Sulyman. A doctor, Aribert Heim, notorious as 'Dr. Death' for conducting medical 'experiments' on prisoners in the Buchenwald, Sachsenhausen and Mathausen concentration camps, took his conversion very seriously. As Tarek Hussein Farid, he sprouted a regulation Islamic beard, prayed daily at the local al Azhov mosque, and became an avid student of the *Koran*. How he must have delighted in its description of the Jews as 'apes and swine' worthy only of death.

Berlin-based Muslims, as well as Nazi ideologists, participated in the exploration of the common ground shared by Islam and Nazism. One such was Zaki Ali. He saw in the concept of the caliphate what he called the '*Fuehrer* of the believers', while 'in accordance with National Socialism, Islam sees the ideal state expressed in the *Fuehrerprinzip*, as Islam knows no dynasty'. (This was not true of 'Twelver' Shi'ism) Finally, there was yet another Berlin-based pro-Nazi Muslim propagandist, Mohammed Sabry. He too undertook a synthesis of Islam and

National Socialism, focusing on their shared hatred of the Jews as the creators of Soviet Communism: 'The Jewish mentality created Bolshevism, and Bolshevism is the carrier of the Jewish mentality. Made by Jews, led by Jews - therewith Bolshevism is the natural enemy of Islam.' (Not necessarily...see Chapter 21... and certainly not today in its re-incarnation as Sharia leftism)

On a more practical level, the Nazi propaganda machine was engaged in a massive drive to win over the Muslim masses of North Africa, the Middle East, Turkey, Persia and India to the Nazi cause. As was to be expected, anti-Semitism and exhortations to take up arms against the Allies were the predominant themes, always re-enforced by appropriate citations from the *Koran*. For this purpose, at Zeesen, a small town south of Berlin, the Nazis established a radio station employing a staff of eighty, including a team of Muslims fluent in the relevant languages headed by the main announcer, the Iraqi journalist Yunus Bahri. Also featured was the Moroccan Pan-Islamist cleric Taqial-Din al-Hilali, who after the war translated the *Koran* into English. Programme content was vetted by the Nazi Foreign Office.

Daily transmissions went out in various Arab dialects, together with programmes in Persian, Turkish and languages spoken by Indian Muslims. In addition to radio broadcasts, the *Luftwaffe* and the *Wehrmacht* either dropped or distributed a total of eight million leaflets in North Africa and the Middle East, again with the same messages, together with 55 issues of the Arabic language journal *Barid al-Sharq*, or Eastern Post. Always avoiding appeals to nationalism, which could, in the event of a Nazi victory, compromise Hitler's geopolitical ambitions in the region, the subject matter and focus was almost exclusively religious and anti-Semitic as here: 'The Jews are planning to violate your women, to kill your children and to destroy you. According to the Muslim religion, the defence of your life is a duty which can only be fulfilled by annihilating the Jews. Kill the Jews before they kill you.'

To ensure a suitably pious tone, broadcasts always began with a citation from the *Koran*, while printed matter was studded with Koranic verses that either focused on the evil deeds of the Jews (5:82) or invocations to do battle with the unbelievers (8:15, 8:16 and 48:27). But round-the clock broadcasts and ton-loads of leaflets flown out from Berlin were not enough. Everything hinged on a Nazi military victory. And for some inscrutable reason, Allah declined to deliver it. After the defeats at Stalingrad and el-Alamein and the Allied landings in Italy, and with the defeat of his Nazi paymasters drawing ever closer, on March 1, 1944, in a speech from Radio Berlin's Islamic station at Zeesen, a now clearly desperate Grand Mufti was still demanding that Muslims 'kill Jews wherever you find them, for the love of God, history and religion'.

Significantly, in the light of the subsequent political evolution of Egypt, the Nazi propaganda drive in North Africa had its greatest success among the two opposed wings of what were to become and have remained the country's two most influential movements, the quasi-secular 'Young Egypt' and the theocratic Muslim Brotherhood, which in 1987, gave birth to Hamas. Both are known to have established contact with Nazi agents as Rommel's Africa Corps tanks rolled eastwards towards Cairo in the summer of 1942. Young Egypt, with its imitation Nazi slogan of 'One Folk, One Party, One Leader', was even then led by Gamal Abdel Nasser, also the moving spirit in its military wing, the equally pro-Nazi Free Officers' movement, together with his presidential successor Anwar Sadat (who was

detained by the British authorities as a known Nazi sympathiser). Their soon to be deadly rivals, the Brotherhood, guided by their founder Hasan al-Bana, were likewise eagerly anticipating a Wehrmacht victory, distributing pro-Nazi leaflets in Cairo in the rather naive expectation that on Rommel's triumphal entry into the Egyptian capital, their Nazi liberators would install them in power.

One would have reasonably expected that at the Second World War's end the Mufti, along with other Muslims complicit in the crimes of the Third Reich, would have been brought to book for his own several roles in the Holocaust. Nothing of the sort. With no specific charges being brought against him, after being briefly detained by the French authorities, he was freed and allowed to resume his lifelong crusade against the Jews and for his own theocratic version of Palestinian and Arab nationalism. And until the emergence of Nasser's and later Arafat's quasi-secular alternatives, the Mufti not only was able to re-claim his pre-war status as a Muslim and Arab leader, but even surpassed it. This was in part because far from his collaboration with the Nazis proving a handicap, it had raised his profile and prestige even higher, since it was not the Germans, but the war-time western Allies who were seen, with reason, as the enemy in the Muslim and Arab worlds. Indeed, though I have searched for them, I have found no adverse comments made by any Arab or Muslim leader either then or subsequently as to his role in the war as a high-profile Nazi collaborator. Quite the contrary in fact. Following his release by the French in May 1946, Hitler's most favoured Muslim arrived in Cairo, to be saluted by the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, Hasan al-Bana, for his 'services for the glory of Islam and the Arabs':

What a hero, what a miracle of a man. We wish the Arab youth, cabinet ministers, rich men, and princes of Palestine, Syria, Iraq, Tunis, Morocco and Tripoli to know that this hero challenged an empire and fought Zionism, with the help of Hitler and Germany. Germany and Hitler have gone, but Amin al-Husseini will continue the struggle.

This greeting tells us everything we need to know about the political pedigree of the Muslim Brotherhood and its Hamas offshoot. Aware that sooner rather than later, the establishment of a Jewish state in the British Mandate would come on to the agenda at the United Nations, the Mufti, together with pro-Nazi Egyptian army officers and radical Arab nationalists such as the youthful Yasser Arafat, attempted to persuade Arab leaders to launch a pre-emptive war of annihilation against the Jews before the creation of Israel received UN approval. More cautious Arab leaders preferred to await the result of the UN's decision, and so the Mufti's plan came to nothing. Then on November 29, 1947, the UN voted for the division of the Mandate into a Jewish and Palestinian state, in doing so endorsing what is now called the 'two-state solution. Belatedly adopting the Mufti's 'all or nothing' strategy as their own, on the day of the Israel's creation, May 14, 1948, the four Arab states which it bordered - Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon - together with forces from Iraq, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Morocco and Yemen, launched an all-out war to crush at birth the new Jewish state. Certain that Allah would grant them victory over a minuscule country defended by mere 'apes and swine', Abd al-Rahman, Secretary General of the Arab League, proclaimed 'this war will be a war of destruction'. He was right. As we have seen, what followed was not only the defeat of the Arab invaders but the dashing of the United Nations plan for the creation of an independent Palestinian state.

Aside from his frustrated campaign to prevent the creation of Israel, another of al-Husseini's concerns at this time was finding employment in Egypt for Nazis fleeing from charges of war crimes, mainly against the Jews. Some were known to him personally as collaborators during his years in Berlin, such as Johann von Leers whom, along with several other escapees, the Mufti succeeded in converting to Islam. In addition to the invaluable assistance provided by the Vatican's 'Rat Line', two German organisations were created to help Nazis make good their escape. One was the notorious ODESSA (*Organisation der ehemaligen SS-Angerhörigen*, or Organisation of Former Members of the SS), with its headquarters in Cairo under its director, al-Husseini's former Berlin colleague Johann von Leers. The other, *Stille Hilfe*, Silent Help, was able to operate quite openly in Munich, because it was fronted by Nazi-sympathising Catholic clergymen. Here too was a Muslim connection. Silent Help not only helped wanted Nazis escape to the Middle East, it did so with the help of the Red Crescent, the Islamic equivalent of the Red Cross. Egypt was the most favoured haven for fleeing Nazis, not only for its proximity to Europe, (and Rome) but because of all the Arab states at that time it was ideologically the most congenial. On the one hand there was the long established theocratic Muslim Brotherhood, and on the other, the Free Officers with its secular brand of pan Arab nationalism. Nazis heading for Cairo were spoilt for choice, because both movements had proved eager and active war-time collaborators with the Nazis and vied with each other in their anti-Semitism. One can easily imagine how they must have congratulated themselves on their choice of refuge when in 1953, the Nazi collaborator Anwar Sadat, now a high-ranking official in the new republican regime, and Nasser's successor as President in 1970, published an Open Letter to Hitler in response to a rumour that his war-time patron and hero was still alive:

I congratulate you with all my heart, because though you appear to have been defeated, you were the real victor. You were able to sow dissension between Churchill and his allies on the one hand and their ally, the devil [i.e., the Jews] on the other.... That you have become immortal in Germany is reason enough for pride. And we should not be surprised to see you again in Germany, or a new Hitler in your place.

This was the Nazi collaborator who, as President of Egypt, described his attack on Israel in 1973 as 'a continuation of humanity's war against Fascism and Nazism'. Had the Brotherhood and not the Free Officers won out in the post-Farouk power struggle, Egypt's exile Nazi colony would have felt no less at home. The ideology was different, but the message, so far as the Jews were concerned, was the same, as was the reverence for Hitler. In a work titled *Our Struggle with the Jews*, dating from 1950, the chief Brotherhood ideologist and close associate of al-Husseini, Sayyid Qutb, we read the following:

The Jews did indeed return to evil doing, so Allah gave to the Muslims power over them. The Muslims then expelled them from the whole of the Arabian Peninsula. Then the Jews again returned to evil-doing and consequently Allah sent them against others of his servants, until the modern period. Then Allah brought Hitler to rule over them. [sic!] And once again today the Jews returned to evil doing, in the form of "Israel" which made the Arabs, the owners of the land, taste of sorrows and woe

For all the Brotherhood's recent re-branding as a moderate force within Islam, nothing essential since then has changed. Hitler is still the hero, and the Jews are still the enemy. In January 2009, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, the Brotherhood's most highly esteemed theologian and much admired by London's former Sharia Mayor Ken Livingstone (see *passim* Volume Two), informed viewers of *Al Jazeera* TV that Hitler had been chosen by Allah to inflict divine retribution on the Jews:

Throughout history, Allah has imposed upon the Jews people who would punish them for their corruption. The last punishment was carried out by Hitler. By means of all the things he did to them - even though they [presumably the Jews] exaggerate the issue - he managed to put them in their place [sic]. This was divine punishment for them. Allah willing, the next time [sic] will be at the hand of the believers.

On those few occasions when the subject is addressed, historians of the Second World War and its aftermath have tended to focus on those Nazis whom the Vatican's Rat Line had spirited away to Roman Catholic South America, the most notorious being Adolf Eichmann., who was provided with a false passport and a boat ticket to Argentina by a Franciscan friar in Genoa. Yet while estimates of Nazi exiles in South America ranged between 180 and 800, according to research conducted by the Simon Wiesenthal Centre in 1967, the number of Nazis afforded a safe haven in Arab states, principally in Egypt and Syria, was of the order of between six and seven *thousand*, many of whom had Jewish blood on their hands. Two Nazis, Bruno Beger, convicted for his part in the deaths of 86 Jews selected for 'medical experiments' at Auschwitz, and SS officer Heinrich Harrer, even found their way to Tibet, where they became part of the inner circle of the then Prince Charles' intimate friend, the Dalai Lama. There could be more than one reason why the Nazi exodus to the Middle East, in contrast to their flight to South America, has remained largely a closed book. But one suspects political correctness and an understandable fear of reactions at the diplomatic level in oil rich Islamic states could have played their part. Be that as it may, there are two obvious questions that need to be asked. Why, firstly, did approximately ten times as many Nazis prefer exile in the Muslim and Arab world instead of Latin and Catholic South America, where cultural adjustments would have been far less problematic, and being located an ocean and a continent away from the scene of their crimes, rendered less likely discovery by allied agents seeking their arrest? Secondly, and equally to the point, why did those who chose the Middle East so easily find government employment in the service of autocratic Arab regimes, while those who opted for South America took up second careers in private business? I leave it to the reader to provide what I think is a patently obvious answer.

One of the biggest Nazi fish to slip through the conveniently large holes of the Allied net and find its way to the Middle East was undoubtedly Alois Brunner, Eichmann's chief assistant in the rounding up and deportation of Jews to the death camps. Evading arrest after the war by assuming a series of aliases, he finally arrived in Cairo in 1954, where he met up again with al-Husseini and von Leers. Still being pursued on war crimes charges, they advised him to move on to Syria, where he served as security adviser to Ba'athist President Hafez el Assad. One of his responsibilities was instructing police officials in Nazi torture techniques. In return for services rendered, Brunner was installed in an official government guest house, safe from extradition and with around the clock security, until his death in

2010. He had no qualms about his part in the Holocaust. The Jews 'deserved to die because they were the devil's agents and human garbage'. His only regret was that he 'didn't finish the job'.

Western politicians from the far left and right with a shared animus against Israel have also been made welcome in Damascus, notably former KKK Grand Wizard, Hitler (and Corbyn) admirer and Holocaust denier David Duke in 2005 and 2018, BNP *Fuehrer* Nick Griffin (another Corbyn admirer) in 2013 and 2014 and...Jeremy Corbyn himself in 2011. Another top-ranking Nazi to be offered sanctuary by Syria was Franz Stangl. After serving his apprenticeship supervising Hitler's 'mercy killing' of the infirm and the mentally sick, he graduated to the rank of Commandant of two death camps, Sobibor, where 300,000 Jews were gassed, and then Treblinka, where 1,200,000 met the same end. Arrested as a war criminal by the US occupying forces at the end of the war, he escaped in 1947 before coming to trial, and via the Vatican's Rat Line and equipped with a forged International Red Cross passport, made his way to Syria, where he was provided with a well-paid job as an engineer in a textile firm, and a luxurious home in Damascus.

Then we have Franz Rademacher and Walter Rauff. Rademacher skipped bail while appealing against his sentence by a West German court of three years and five months (sic) for complicity in the murder of 1,500 Yugoslav Jews. (How many did it take to get a life sentence?) Unlike most Nazi exiles, Rademacher fell out with his hosts, and chose to return to Germany, where a sympathetic court decreed that his ludicrously short prison term had already been technically served. By contrast, Rauff, the inventor of the mobile Jew gassing van, landed on his feet. He was another of the thousands who, thanks to the services of the Vatican, made good his escape via ultra-Catholic Austria and so down the Brenner Pass to Rome. The Papacy clearly maintained a special relationship not only with Catholic and Peronist Argentina, the main destination of hundreds of on-the-run Nazis, but also Muslim Syria as well as Egypt, because while still in Rome under the protection of the Vatican, Rauff was put in touch with the Syrian Embassy, which served as a recruiting agency for Nazis seeking a new home and an opportunity to exercise their old skills. Rauff related how he 'signed a contract with the Syrian government and went to Damascus as a technical adviser [sic] to the secret police and the bodyguard of the head of state'. Bear in mind that at the same time the Vatican was collaborating with Muslim Arab states to enable the mass murderers of Jews to escape Allied justice, it was waging an unceasing, though unsuccessful, campaign to prevent the establishment, and then the diplomatic recognition of the state of Israel.

However, Egypt rather than Syria was the most favoured sanctuary for Nazis on the run. One Jew-killer to rise to the very summits of Arab power was Oskar Dirlewanger, a leading pogromist in Nazi occupied Ukraine, who later served as President Nasser's bodyguard. In addition to the SS and Gestapo, other criminal personnel of the Third Reich also provided their fair share of recruits to Israel's Arab enemies, including two 'Doctors'. Hans Eisele's favourite pastime was injecting Dachau inmates with cyanide, while Dr. Heinrich Wilkemann, like Eisele, was wanted by the Allies for conducting experiments on mainly Jewish prisoners at Dachau Concentration Camp. He was also hired to work at another camp, this time in Egypt at Samara, where he trained terrorists to kill Israeli Jews. Yet another Jew-killer, Kurt Baumann, the officer responsible for the 'liquidation' of the Warsaw Ghetto, found employment with Nasser in Egypt's War Ministry. One of his duties was instructor to the Jew-killing terrorist Popular Front for the Liberation

of Palestine. Baumann must have felt very much at home in this environment, as the (leftist) PLFP made a point of displaying pictures of Hitler around its training camp. Finally, there was Joachim Daemling, head of the Düsseldorf Gestapo, who naturally took up employment in the Egyptian prison system. These and other seasoned Nazi genocidists too numerous to mention, all of whom if caught by the Allies faced either death sentences or long prison terms for their crimes against the Jews, were attracted to the world of Islam like iron filings to a magnet, not just as a place of congenial refuge, but as a Muslim Fourth Reich, where the task of completing Hitler and Allah's 'Final Solution of the Jewish Question' with, ironically, the military backing of Nasser's patron, 'Jewish Bolshevik' Russia, could at last be accomplished. But it is the Zionists who are the Nazis.

All the evidence dating from that period, and it is voluminous if, not accidentally, little known, points to a symbiotic relationship between Nazism and Islam. Understandably, attempts to make it better known are not always appreciated. It seems that there are times, even in, of all places, Berlin, when historical truth about the Holocaust has to take second place to 'diversity', 'cultural sensitivity', 'inclusivity' and political expediency. Just how sensitive the Nazi-Islam connection could become was illustrated in September 2009, when the German historian Karl Roessel organized an exhibition titled 'The Third World in the Second World War' at the *Werkstatt der Kulturen*, a publicly-funded 'multicultural' centre in Berlin. But there is multiculturalism and multiculturalism, as Roessel quickly discovered. His was definitely the wrong kind, because a small section of the exhibition featured the part played by Islamic and Arab leaders in the crimes of the Third Reich. After the inevitable and orchestrated protests by offended Muslim history buffs, the Centre's Director, Philippa Ebene, closed down the entire exhibition, not because it told untruths about the Islamo-Nazi connection, but because it threatened to undermine Germany's diplomatic standing with Turkey...as did the Bundestag resolution acknowledging the Turkish genocide of the Armenians.

This reluctance, to put it at its mildest, to confront the relationship between Islam and the Third Reich has even had its impact on the teaching of the Holocaust in German state schools, institutions where one would assume that in the light of the country's not so distant past, no effort or expense would be spared to instil into the young the lesson of what ensues when those who hate Jews are placed in positions of total power. Yet the Bavarian branch of Chancellor Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Party, the ultra-conservative and deeply Catholic Christian Social Union, did not agree. It had long been the practice that all pupils who attend Bavaria's academically-oriented secondary schools, the Gymnasiums, were obliged to visit Holocaust memorials as an integral part of their school's curriculum. When, in 20015, the centrist Free Voter Party (*Freie Wähler*) made the eminently sensible proposal that all secondary school pupils, and not just those attending Gymnasiums, should make the same visits, the CSU's Klaus Steiner objected: 'Especially in state schools we have immigrants and the children of asylum seekers. Many of them are children from Muslim families who have no connection to our past and who will need much more time before they can identify with our history. We need to be careful [sic] about how we address this issue with these children.' 'No connection with Germany's past'? Really? Even if it were true, should that be a reason for not teaching German history in German schools to non-German children, whatever their background? Even more to the point, as children of Muslim parentage they will in all probability have already imbibed similar prejudices against Jews to those

held by the creators of the death camps that, if the CSU had its way, they would not be obliged to visit. Why should they be left in ignorance of the fact that Hitler's favourite Muslim, al-Husseini, together with his cohort of Nazi collaborators, approved of and assisted in the Holocaust, and sought Nazi aid to perpetrate one of their own in Middle East? How does it help the integration of young Muslims into German society by creating for them a segregationist, Islam-friendly history curriculum that insulates them from confronting the consequences of anti-Semitism? 'Need to be careful'? Yes. We need to be careful that those most exposed to anti-Semitic infections need the earliest and most effective treatment possible. And where practicable, as it is in Germany, what better antidote than visits to Holocaust memorials?

To conclude the saga of the Mufti. It is not as if the Nazi-Muslim nexus was severed by the defeat of the Axis powers in 1945. In the 1950s, as head of the Islamic World Congress, the forerunner of the 57-member Organisation of the Islamic Conference, al-Husseini extended his influence far beyond the Middle East. Amazingly, despite his well-known and never-renounced Nazi past, the former Grand Mufti became a highly respected personality in a so-called 'non-aligned' movement that only attacked the west and never the Soviet bloc or China. He was a prominent figure at its launching in Bandung, Indonesia, in 1955, meeting no fewer than 29 state leaders, including the host President Sukarno and Prime Minister Nehru of India. But back in the Middle East, things were not going so well. Secular Arab nationalism was in the ascendant, represented by Nasser in Egypt and the Nazi-influenced Ba'ath in Syria and Iraq. The no less secular-inclined Yasser Arafat was now the new rising figure in Palestinian affairs, and whereas al-Husseini had looked north to Nazi Berlin for deliverance, Arafat's PLO looked east to 'Jewish Bolshevik atheist' Moscow, as did his patron, President Nasser of Egypt, who sought the means to modernise his country's antiquated military and economic infrastructure before launching a war that was intended to complete Hitler's mission by annihilating Israel.

7 Hubris

While his pan Arabism was couched in mainly secular terms, and was frequently and highly critical of the more conservative and devout Arab leaders, Nasser was no less set on the destruction of Israel than the theocratic Jihadis who came before and after him. From the beginning of his Presidency in 1955, Nasser saw his role as not only the spokesman but the instrument of Arab unity. An abortive attempt at a union with Syria (1958 to 1961) left Nasser still seeking an issue around which all the warring factions and states of the Arab world could be united. His choice, partly by default, fell on the Palestinians, and with it, the goal of destroying Israel. Here at least was an undertaking on which al-Husseini's theocrats, Arab potentates, fascist Ba'athists and the secular militarists could all agree. The problem for Nasser was, how to sustain and validate his self-proclaimed role as unifier and liberator of the Arabs. Sooner rather than later, anti-Zionist invective would have to be transformed into action. The years went by. Then in February 1964, Nasser ratcheted up the rhetoric: 'The possibilities of the future will be war with Israel. It is we who will dictate the time. It is we who will dictate the place.' Ba'athist Syria's Defence (sic) Minister responded in similar vein: 'The Syria army stands as a mountain to crush Israel and demolish her. This army knows how to crush its enemies.'

This could not go on indefinitely. Blood curdling threats were being made. Soviet arms were piling up in depots. Arab troops were drilling and massing on Israel's borders. They would either have to be unleashed, or risk those who had mobilised them losing all political credibility both at home and abroad. Trapped in a hole of his own digging, Nasser kept on digging. Finally, in May 1967, he set about turning words into action. First he demanded the withdrawal of the UN peace-keeping force stationed since the Suez War of 1956 on the Egypt-Israel border. Without any authorisation from the UN Security Council, UN Secretary General U Thant did as he was told. The road was now clear, so Nasser's generals believed, for a settling of accounts with the Jews. Posing as both the champion of Arab unity and the liberator of the Palestinians (whilst still illegally occupying the Palestinian Gaza Strip that King Farouk had seized in 1949), on the 24th, Nasser (again, illegally) closed the Straits of Tiran at Sharm al Shaykh, which dominates the southern exit of the Suez Canal and, crucially, closed the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, a *casus belli* under international law. The purpose of this action became clear in a series of belligerent statements made by Nasser and the Egyptian media. On the next day, May 25, Cairo Radio proclaimed that 'the Arab people is firmly resolved to wipe Israel off the map', (a pledge later renewed by Iran) while President Nasser announced that 'our forces are fully mobilised both in Gaza and Sinai'. Although claiming it was 'the Jews' that 'threaten war', he continued: 'We tell them you are welcome. We are ready for war. Our armed forces and all our people are ready for war'. The next day, May 26, Nasser effectively admitted that it was he, and not Israel, that was seeking and preparing for war: 'Taking Sharm al Shaykh meant confrontation with Israel. Taking such action also meant that we were ready for general war with Israel...*our basic objective will be to destroy Israel.*' (Emphasis added)

On May 29 Nasser announced that 'preparations have been made. We are now ready to confront Israel...Now we are ready for the confrontation. We are now ready to deal with the entire Palestinian question.' This was a lie. Neither Nasser, nor his reluctant ally King Hussain had any intention of contributing to the solution of the 'Palestinian question', which could have been peacefully resolved by handing back to the Palestinians the two territories which Egypt and Jordan had illegally seized in 1949 after losing their war against Israel. Instead, the plan was to add to their illegal acquisitions by invading and conquering Israel, a state no bigger than the size of Wales and with a Jewish population of a little over two million compared to the 40 million of its potential Arab attackers, Egypt, Jordan and Syria, a population, who had no desire to be 'liberated' by a regime staffed from top to bottom by Nazi war criminals. Under pressure to match Nasser's bellicose stance, King Hussain of Jordan, who, like the Saudi monarchy, posed as an ally of the west, now felt obliged to validate his loyalty to the Arab cause. He urged his troops, in language redolent of the Mufti, to stage a vast pogrom: 'Kill the Jews wherever you find them. Kill them with your bare hands, with your nails and teeth.'

Adding to the 240,000 Egyptian, Syrian and Jordanian troops now mobilised close to or on Israel's borders were contingents from Kuwait, Iraq, Libya and Sudan. So with all Egypt's military preparations now complete, on June 3, General Murtagi, Commander of all Egyptian forces in Sinai, issued his Orwellian Order of the Day: 'The eyes of the world are upon you in your most glorious war against the Israeli imperialist aggressors on the soil of your fatherland. [There were no Israeli troops on the soil, or rather sand, of Egypt, or any other Arab state for that matter.] Your holy war [i.e., *Jihad*] for the recapture of the rights of the Arab nation [will] recapture anew the robbed land of Palestine by the grace of God and of justice, by the power of your weapons and the unity of your faith.'

Israel's military and political leaders could wait no longer. Its minuscule territory, vastly smaller population and less than one third of the military hardware of its enemies, excluded the likelihood of victory in war of attrition, while the mobilisation of its largely reservist 100,000 effectives had brought the country's economy to a near standstill. With France and the USA refusing, for fear of the reaction in the Arab world, to honour their military contracts with Israel, the choice was therefore between a pre-emptive strike or a massive Arab invasion, defeat and a possible second Holocaust. Just as any government would have done in similar circumstances, on June 5, they chose the first option. Nevertheless, Israel was subsequently almost universally condemned as the aggressor.

Israel's crushing six-day victory in a war its enemies had sought and provoked did not immediately sound the death knell for secular Arab nationalism, though Nasser's pan-Arabist dream had proved to be just that. Officially at least, Egypt's defeat had changed nothing. There would be no peace treaty with, or recognition of, the 'Zionist Entity', the only two conditions Israel required to be met in return for its withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, which it had occupied in the course of the war. Had these two entirely reasonable terms been complied with in 1967, and had Israel's Arab neighbours, principally Egypt and Jordan, then allowed the Palestinians of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to establish their own independent Palestinian state, there would be no Middle East problem as we have come to know it these last sixty or more years. Unfortunately for the Palestinians, Nasser had priorities that ranked above peace in the Middle East. Fearing a further loss of personal prestige, a year later, Nasser was sounding as intransigent as ever:

'No negotiations with Israel, no peace with Israel, no recognition of Israel, and no deals at the expense of Palestinian soil or the Palestinian people...Israel wants direct negotiations and a peace treaty signed. We reject this.' But here also was a hint of a new policy. With the eviction by Israel of Jordan and Egypt from their illegal annexation and occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and the self-evident failure of Nasserite and Ba'athist Pan-Arabism, it became both convenient and expedient to shift the focus even more sharply to the Palestinian question, since these territories were now under Israeli and not Arab occupation. Nasser must have realised what the prospects of success were for the PLO after the combined strength of three well equipped regular armies had been outfought and outthought in six days by a state with a largely part-time army and a total population of what was then only 2.6 million. But publicly at least, the hope was entertained that perhaps guerrilla terrorism might succeed where conventional methods of warfare had failed. Yet for all the talk of Arab solidarity with the Palestinians, Nasser made it clear that so far as military action was concerned, the PLO was on its own: 'Not only we, but the entire world sense that the Palestinians have risen to champion their own cause and to defend their rights by themselves.'

Like Nasser prior to his June War fiasco, with the PLO there was no shortage of verbal belligerence. Article Nine of its founding Covenant stated that 'armed struggle is the only way to liberate Palestine' while Article Ten defined what it termed 'commando actions' as 'the nucleus of the Palestinian liberation war'. And so as Syria, Jordan and Egypt licked their self-inflicted wounds, the PLO began to move centre stage in Arab affairs. Making the Palestinians the central issue also had the advantage of yet again casting the Jews in their time-honoured double role of scapegoat for and diversion from failings and problems whose causes lay elsewhere, purposes they have continued to serve in the Arab world up until the present day. As was the case with Hitler, if the Jews had not existed, the leaders of the Arabs would have had to invent them.

We have already noted that Fatah (and even more so the rival movements it spawned) was essentially secular in outlook. But for all its noisy denunciations of a 'Zionist fascism', it betrayed in its own propaganda, philosophy and especially its rhetoric an affinity with the genuine article in both its German and Italian varieties, with recurring phrases and images glorifying the redemptive role of violence and destruction, and the coming triumph of Arab will over Jewish matter: 'Blazing our armed revolution inside the occupied territory [i.e., of Israel itself, since this was pre-1967] is a healing medicine for all our people's diseases', one to be administered by 'the movement of revolutionary gathering of the revengeful conscious wills', one led into battle by a 'vanguard distinguished by [its] revolutionary intuition'. A true leader was one who could 'elevate himself by his consciousness until he releases himself from reality's grip [sic], in order to pursue the superseding of this reality by another, which differs basically in its values and traits'.

Couched in Mussolini-style bombast and Bergsonian mysticism, the message was that the Fatah warrior, by an act of sheer will power, must be expected to cast aside all conventional scruples and, by overcoming all material obstacles, transform himself into an amoral, dynamic, Jew-killing superman. In a similar manner, what Fatah called a 'current of vitality in the form of a revolutionary vanguard' (a Leninist as well as fascist concept) would inspire the 'hating vengeful masses', unleashing 'tempests of revenge'. These masses would then 'plunge into the road of revolution in a pressing and vehement fashion as pouring forces that burn

everything [sic] that stands in their way'. Bearing in mind who the targets of these 'hating vengeful masses' were, what was being advocated, anticipated and indeed prepared here was nothing less than a massive pogrom of the Jews on the scale that al-Husseini hoped to achieve in his years of collaboration with the Third Reich.

The objective was quite clear. It was 'to wipe out [sic] the existential trace [sic] of this artificial [sic] phenomenon...the blotting out [sic] of the Zionist character of the occupied land, be it human [sic] or social.... regardless of method, be it smashing or annihilation [sic!!!!]'. This is what Arafat described with a typical PLO euphemism as 'the liberation of the Jews from Zionism'. The proposed means of its achievement echoed the cryptic motto the Nazis erected over the entrance to Auschwitz: *Arbeit Macht Frei*. Here we had combined in the programme of the PLO not only the language of a Mussolini, but the methods of a Himmler. Palestine must be rendered Zionist free, therefore Jew free. But it is the Jews, remember, who were the Nazis, the fascists and the genocidists.

Radical though all this sounded, for some, especially Arab intellectuals, it was still not radical enough. They wanted action, not rhetoric and bombast. First to break away from Fatah was the small group led by the self-styled 'Marxist-Leninist' George Habash calling itself the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Its claim to be more leftist than Fatah did not sit easily with pictures of Hitler that visiting German urban terrorists saw displayed at its headquarters.

While insisting, for all its undisguised veneration of Hitler, that Israel was a 'racist, fascist and aggressive state', the PFLP advocated actions that went beyond sporadic and usually ineffective guerrilla raids into Israeli territory. The Front's idea of radicalism consisted largely of staging spectacular passenger jet hijackings and the kidnapping and murder of Jewish civilians. But again, even this was not radical enough for some. In 1969, Na'if Hawatmeh led a tiny group out of the PFLP to form the Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine. As was the way with such Arab splinter groups, the two 'fronts' soon came to blows. After an escalating series of tit-for-tat assassinations Arafat imposed a truce on the warring factions, one confining them to the margins of Palestinian power politics. Henceforth, their activities were to be limited to overseas operations, such as airline hijackings and kidnappings of Jews.

While Arafat was prepared to use them in this role, he understood that they were a menace to his goal of seeking legitimacy not only in the Arab world, but in the eyes of the west. It was also all too obvious that with the fire-eating rhetoric and amassing of private arsenals, and despite the insertion of the word into its title, the PDFLP was no more democratic than the PFLP was popular. As a spokesman for the former explained at a gathering of the PLO: 'When we speak of democracy it must be clear that we do not mean liberal democracy in the manner of "one man one vote."' That we can believe. The precise nature of the intended 'manner' was left undefined, but it is reasonable to assume that with 90% of Israel's population being Jewish, it would be the Jews who would find themselves on the receiving end.

Finally, we come to the yet tinier though as was always the rule, lavishly-funded groups that while being 'Fronts' affiliated to the PLO, were sponsored by, and therefore answerable to Arab states with a special interest in the Palestinian question, these being, apart from the PLO's main patron Egypt, the governments of Libya, Syria and Iraq. A spokesman for one such outfit, the Syrian-backed Sa'iqa, unlike most others who shared his objectives, was remarkably frank about the fate

intended for the Israeli Jews after their 'liberation' from Zionism. He admitted that he was 'among those who thought five years ago that we must slaughter the Jews'. He had changed his mind, though not on account of any moral qualms he might have felt as a perpetrator of a second, Arab and Islamic Holocaust of the Jews: 'But now I cannot imagine that, if we win one night, it will possible for us to slaughter them, or even one tenth of them. What do we do with these Jews? This is a problem for which I do not claim to have a ready answer.' Whatever that 'answer' might have been, it was best not to advertise it, as Farid al-Hut of the PFLP explained: 'It is advisable to hold back additional information until the appropriate stages in the evolution of the resistance [sic] are reached.'

One can see from these exchanges between the various factions of the PLO that there were then, just as there are now, a wide range of views on how best to proceed with the war against Israel. But what they all shared, and still share, is a determination to eliminate entirely, either by genocide, expulsion or a reign of terror, all traces of Jewish culture and Israeli institutions, in order to replace them with their various versions of a 'liberated' Palestine. Herein resides their continuity with the Nazi 'Final Solution' embraced by al-Husseini and his band of aspiring genocidists.

The changing of the guard in the PLO arising from this strategic shift to the focus on Palestine was formalised at a final meeting between king-maker al-Husseini and Arafat at the former's home in Beirut on December 29, 1968. Despite their widely diverging tactics and philosophy, their goals were the same, and on this basis, as the still-revered Godfather of Palestinian nationalism, al-Husseini was prepared to give Arafat his blessing as the new Chairman of the PLO, displacing the aging and less than charismatic Yahya Hamuda. Despite al-Husseini's years of quite open collaboration with the Nazis, Arafat never made any attempt to conceal his admiration for his patron. In an interview by the London Arabic daily, *Al Sharq al Awsat*, published on August 2, 2002, Arafat refuted rumours that the PLO was dancing to the tune of the USA: 'We are not Afghanistan. We are the Mighty People. Were they able to replace our hero Haj Amin al-Husseini? There were a number of attempts to get rid of Haj Amin, whom they considered an ally of the Nazis. [Which, as Arafat knew full well, he was] But even so, he lived in Cairo, and participated in the 1948 war [against newly independent Israel], and I was one of his troops.'

Even though the theological and political legacy of al-Husseini endured, mainly due to its preservation by the hard-pressed Muslim Brotherhood, through the sixties and into the seventies, it must have seemed as if his brand of Islamic politics was a spent force in the Arab world, at least so far as militant anti-Zionism was concerned. But then, especially after the Oslo Accords of 1993, which involved the recognition, at least on paper, of Israel by the PLO, the tide turned again, away from the quasi-secular leftists and militarists and back towards the theocrats and Islamic Jihadis. Five years after al-Husseini's death in 1974, the Ayatollahs seized power in Iran, while in the Middle East, the bankruptcy of both Nasserite pan-Arabism and Ba'athism was becoming increasingly obvious. Hints of what was to come could be detected in the otherwise secularist anti-Zionist rhetoric of Anwar Sadat, who replaced President Nasser after the latter's death in 1970. In breaking with Nasser's policy of reliance on the Soviet Union, whose Middle Eastern agenda did not always coincide with those of the Arab leaders, Sadat saw the need to introduce a new note into the mainly secular Pan-Arabism of his predecessor. The first outward indications of this shift came in April 1972 when Sadat chose the

occasion of Mohammed's birthday to announce his intention, as Arab leaders from time to time were obliged to do, to launch yet another (doomed) attack against the 'Zionist entity'. Only this time, the war would be one of faith as well as of nation: 'We will, with God's help, take it [Palestine] back from those of whom our Book says that lowliness and submissiveness is their lot'. Sadat also employed identical religious exhortations during the 'Yom Kippur' war that followed in October 1973, when he concluded a speech in a manner that today, we would recognise as that of a Hamas or Hezbollah Jihadi, and also one that could have come from the lips of al-Husseini: 'God, be our support and guide. God, bless our people and our nation, God you have promised and your promise is truth. if you support God He will support your and guide your steps.' For whatever inscrutable reasons, God's support was once again not forthcoming, so after yet another defeat at the hands of Israel, despite the combined mobilisation with Syria of one million effectives compared to Israel's 400,000, and having twice as many tanks, the one-time Nazi collaborator and avowed admirer of Hitler broke decisively with anti-Zionist Pan Arabism and after several years of covert negotiations, in 1979 defied the Islamic and Arab taboo by concluding a formal peace treaty with Israel, one that has endured to this day. Its terms included mutual diplomatic recognition, the return to Egypt of territories occupied by Israel since the June war of 1967, and the free passage of Israeli shipping in Egyptian territorial waters. Two years later, Sadat paid the supreme penalty for recognising the 'Zionist entity' when he was assassinated by an army officer with links to Islamic *Jihad*.

There were other setbacks for militant secular Arabism after the death of Nasser. Eight years of debilitating and futile war with theocratic Iran, followed by a genocidal attack on the Kurds and, in 1990, a doomed invasion of Kuwait, set Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist tyranny on a course for self-destruction. Then came the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Arafat, and with him, the more secular Arab states, had emulated al-Husseini in backing a loser. However, his subsequent turn to the west, and his acceptance, if only in words, of the Oslo Accords' 'two-state solution', merely served to further stoke up the fires of theocratic Jihadism. In fact, as early as 1993, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin had predicted 'a rise of Hamas in particular and, radical Islam in general'. The subsequent emergence of Hamas culminated in its successful challenge in 2006 to the rule of Fatah in Gaza. The stage was now set for a return, in a different guise to be sure, of the theocratic and virulently anti-western, anti-left, and anti-Semitic Jihadism preached and practised by al-Husseini. and his team of aspiring Muslim Quislings. Hamas, Hezbollah, ISIS, Al Qaeda, Al Shabaab, Boko Haram, Islamic *Jihad*, the Taliban...each are their legitimate heirs. But unlike the Mufti, what they lacked was a world power patron, so instead they had to seek the patronage of Saudi princes, Gulf sheikhs and Iranian Ayatollahs. And as a bonus, they had the support of the Sharia left and its basement Chomsky, Jeremy Corbyn.

8 Genocide...but whose?

'Israel has committed 50 massacres, 50 Holocausts.' Palestine Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, Berlin, August 16, 2022

Out of a misplaced concern for Muslim sensitivities, nobody of any political standing or authority today uses the term 'Islamofascism' coined by President George Bush, despite its being infinitely more appropriate than the ludicrous 'religion of peace'. Leaving aside for the moment the scriptural imperatives for Muslims to wage a war of global conquest for Allah (See Appendix L), the evidence that leading Islamic figures, including the most prominent Palestinian cleric of his day, and prominent Arab statesmen and army officers, collaborated with the Nazi Reich, is irrefutable and overwhelming, as is likewise that of Nazi war criminals continuing this collaboration by holding important posts in post-war Arab regimes sworn to the destruction of Israel and at the very least, the expulsion of its Jewish population. As to the truth of claims of a Zionist-Nazi conspiracy trumpeted by the synchronised voices of Sharia leftism and Muslim propaganda, this would require believing that a well-documented and thoroughly researched combined Nazi/Muslim genocidal operation, authorised and supervised by the top Nazi leadership, entered into willingly by numerous Muslim leaders, embracing three continents and consuming substantial quantities of German as well as Muslim manpower, time, facilities and resources, was conducted in parallel and simultaneously with an entirely contrary undertaking, likewise sanctioned by Hitler, and for which there exists no evidence whatsoever, to impose a Jewish state on these same Muslims.

Accompanying this accusation is a related Orwellian 'double think'. While on US campuses, mainly Muslim anti-Zionist mobs can be seen and heard in on-line videos chanting 'Nazi pigs' and 'baby killers at Jewish students, in the Middle East, no attempt is made to hide the deep affection, admiration and gratitude felt for the Mufti's Nazi idol, ally and would-be saviour of the Palestinians. True, no one, excepting of course the prophet, is above criticism, not even Hitler. The official Egyptian daily, *Al-Akhbar*, explained why, on April 18, 2001: 'Our thanks go to the late Hitler, who wrought, in advance, the vengeance of the Palestinians upon the most despicable villains on the face of the earth. However, we rebuke Hitler for the fact that the vengeance was insufficient.' So, as Yusuf al-Qaradawi, Livingstone's favourite Muslim cleric, a 'progressive voice for change in the world of Islam' no less, explained (See Chapter 6), the task will have to be completed by the legions of Allah.

However, while Qaradawi never disguised his esteem for Hitler or his hatred of the Jews, this was not the case with the grotesque charade played out at the UK's Holocaust Memorial Day ceremony on January 27, 2013. The event, held at London's City Hall, featured an address delivered to an audience of VIPs that included London Mayor Boris Johnson and former Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks. Perhaps to give the occasion a 'multicultural' as well as ecumenical flavour, the speaker selected was a Muslim student with a 'third world' background from the East London Newham Sixth Form College. He read from a prepared text, which

naturally condemned the Holocaust in ringing terms. Everything appeared as it should be, with the youthful voice of progressive Islam condemning Nazism and all its works. And yet it was not. A little on-line digging into the profile of the speaker by those who selected him would have revealed that Hassan Farooq had intimate connections with organisations which regarded the Holocaust as an event to celebrate rather than condemn and commemorate. Farooq was a 'senior member' of an Islamic organisation that went by the name of the 'Newham Dawah Team'. Following the well-trodden path of Islamic 'umbrella' organisations that at one level, pose successfully as tax exempted 'charities', and at another, fund activities that are anything but charitable, the (as always) innocuous sounding 'Dawah Team' ('Dawah means 'to invite') was in turn a constituent part of the 'Islamic Education and Research Academy [no less!] Network'. The nature and academic level of the 'research' conducted by this institution can perhaps be captured by the views of one its leading officials, Abdurraheem Green. A typically zealous convert, he advocated wife beating, the stoning to death of homosexuals, believed Jews were 'inferior' and gave off a 'stench', and that Ataturk, the secularising founder of modern Turkey, was a Jew. It was no surprise then to learn that Farooq's 'Academy' adhered to the Salafi school of Islam; in popular parlance, what would be called the extreme of the extremes, a school which grooms and supplies most of the Jihadis waging Allah's global war on the infidel. For this reason, several of the IERA's officials had been banned from the UK.

Let us now look more closely at the credentials that presumably ensured Hassan Farooq's selection, in preference to any other candidate, as the keynote speaker at the Holocaust commemoration event. A student of Newham Sixth Form College, Farooq was a prominent member of its Islamic Society. Back in 2005, the Society had already made its mark by recording (by males only of course) a prayer to Allah calling for the extermination of the Jews. Evidently, the College authorities, like so many other public institutions, ever eager to promote 'diversity' and 'inclusivity', saw no problem with this, because the Society went on in 2009 to produce a video on the theme of...yes, of course, 'War on the Jews'. One could object, and rightly, surely this is guilt by association. Farooq was not even a student at the college when these, some might say, youthful excesses occurred, let alone a member of its Society. True. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the college had over the years proved itself willing to tolerate and even facilitate the most extreme manifestations of anti-Semitism which, it is reasonable to assume continued into the time Farouk was a student at the college. Be that as it may, let us look at what Farooq himself has to say about those whose murder by the Nazis he appeared to deplore at London's City Hall. Here we have a small selection from comments Farooq posted on line:

The hour will not come until the Muslims kill the Jews.
 Let's go Jewish bashing.
 I look up to Hitler.
 Gassing is my hobby.

Farooq also had the usual primitive Muslim views about women, flavoured with racism and an equally typical Islamic disdain for democracy: 'I hate Pakistani women with a passion' and 'Female minds are like democracy. Confused.' The question naturally arises: How did it come about that of all the possible candidates

that might have been selected to give such an address, the one finally preferred was a prominent member of organisations with a well-advertised anti-Semitic and terrorist pedigree? But worse, the speaker was himself a raging anti-Semite, and, like so many other Muslims, an unashamed and open admirer of the instigator and chief architect of the Holocaust he was commemorating, Adolf Hitler. One can only speculate, but a possible, even likely scenario is that it was felt by the organisers of the event that in the interests of promoting 'diversity' and 'inclusivity', the politically correct thing to do would be to invite a representative of the religion that however unfairly, had acquired the reputation, especially where its younger male devotees were concerned, of being less kindly disposed towards the Jews than it should be. What better refutation of an unfounded accusation so typical of 'Islamophobia' than to invite a well-educated young male Muslim to clear up the confusion? And of course, as an added bonus, featuring a Muslim speaker would give the lie to accusations that the event had been hijacked by Zionists out to 'glorify the state of Israel'. It is also very likely that the final selection of the speaker was delegated to an organisation assumed to be representative of 'mainstream' or 'moderate' Islam, in ignorance of the fact that Islam does not acknowledge competing versions of itself, since there is only one Islam; that of the *Koran* and the *Hadith*, with their *Jihad*, hatred of Jews, contempt for women, persecution of gays and the rest. And as his own on line comments proved, this was the Islam that Farooq believed in, and which his Sharia law allowed him to conceal for the duration of his speech, namely the tactic of deception or lying when it furthered the cause of Islam, called in Arabic *taqiyya*. The result of this deception, the one intended, was to display to *kuffars* gullible enough to be fooled by it an Islam that was not only not anti-Semitic, but which deplored the Holocaust as much as any Jew. The masquerade over, four months later Farooq returned to his Salafist vomit, saluting online the murderers of Fusillier Lee Rigby.

Since the likes of Farooq, not to speak of their allies on both the infidel far left and right, routinely accuse Israel of the genocide of the Palestinians, let us first be clear about what genocide is and is not. Genocide is not the killing of civilians during the course of a war. All modern military conflicts, those between Hamas and Israel included, have led to the deaths of civilians on both sides, sometimes intentionally, as in the Second War's Nazi 'blitz' and Allied 'strategic bombing', and sometimes not, as was the case, with rare exceptions, in the First World War. In all these cases, the purpose was to win a war, by any means deemed necessary, means which did not include the deliberate extermination of entire populations.

The unique nature and sheer scale of genocide necessarily determines that it cannot be a mere by-product of some other action, and therefore that it is, by definition and under international criminal law, the *deliberate* extermination of an entire people or 'race'. This is what the Muslim Turks did to the Christian Armenians in the First World War, and Nazis did to the Jews in the Second, not as one of the many secondary consequences of the two wars, but as an undertaking that because of its centrality to Islamic and Nazi doctrine, to the very end diverted desperately needed vital resources and manpower away from the war against the 'official' enemy. In the case of the Nazi genocide, this distinction was necessarily blurred, lending it an extra dimension of fanaticism and scope, because Germany's military enemies, 'Jewish Bolshevism' and 'Jewish plutocracy', were also seen as the two different faces of the same all-embracing global Jewish conspiracy. Given its scale - the murder of six million Jews - the Holocaust

necessarily conflicted with Hitler's purely military objectives, and without doubt helped to render them unachievable. But it nevertheless ground on to the last days of the Third Reich because, from the birth of the movement in 1920, Jew-hatred was the Nazis' ruling obsession. Auschwitz Commandant Rudolf Hoess, personally responsible for the murder of more than one million Jews, put it thus: 'We have lost the war, but defeated the Jews'. Or, as a leading Liberal Rabbi of the time, Harvard graduate Dr Mattuck put it, only from the standpoint of the victims, 'War does not supply the shadow of an excuse for the massacres; there is no military value in killing Jewish children.' *It is this, the deliberate extermination of an entire people, ten million or more Palestinians, regardless of any other objectives or consequences, which Israel is accused of by its enemies, without any evidence whatsoever to support it.*

The government-funded Muslim Council of Britain, the main Islamic partner of the anti-Zionist left in the UK, justified its refusal to participate in the annual commemoration of the Nazi genocide of the Jews on the grounds that the Jews of Israel were committing, quote, an 'ongoing genocide' of the Palestinians. To cynically use the term 'genocide' in this way, or indeed in any other than its true historic meaning and context (I cite examples in this book) is to debase the term, and by so doing, one suspects in some cases intentionally, minimise the magnitude of the crimes committed by the Nazis against the Jews. The claim that the Jews of Israel were exterminating the Palestinians was never stated more clearly than by the Reverend Allan Boesak, who testified at the Russell Peace Foundation Tribunal, held in Cape Town, South Africa in 2011. The purpose of the tribunal, all of whose jurors were high profile anti-Zionists, was to investigate and, given the composition of the jury, substantiate the charge that that Israel was an apartheid state. After a week's visit to Israel Boesak concluded that what he called the 'separation', that is, apartheid, imposed on the Palestinians of Israel was for 'the sole purpose of [their] extinction, destruction and extermination'. All three, no less. But still the Palestinian population continued to rise faster than those who engaged in this triple assault.

Despite the many doctrinal divergences that separate the world's Christian churches, when it is a question of condemning Israel, many speak with a similar voice. Boesak was a follower of Calvin, whose doctrine of predestination the Catholic Church defines as heretical. Even so, the Vatican's *L'Osservatore Romano* has also claimed that Israel's alleged 'aggression' against the Palestinians has escalated into a war of 'extermination', while Norbert Blum, a former (devoutly Roman Catholic) German Christian Democratic Party Minister of Labour, likewise spoke of Israel's 'ruthless war of destruction', terms normally reserved for describing his own country's onslaught on the Soviet Union and the Jews in the Second World War. The Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, has likened Israel to Nazi Germany, with Bob Ross of its Israel-Palestine Steering Committee Mission Networks calling for an economic boycott of Israel for its 'human rights abuses and, frankly, genocide of the Palestinians.' Novelist and critic A.N. Wilson, who lost god only to find him again, in the London *Evening Standard* of April 15, 2002, not only accused Israel of 'massacre' and 'genocide' (nothing out of the ordinary there), he also revived the medieval Christian myth of what he described as the Jewish 'poisoning of [Palestinian] water supplies'. Here then we have proof that the propaganda campaign depicting the Israeli Jews as the 'new Nazis' hell bent on exterminating the Palestinians has met with success far

beyond the left. This is not only a damning moral indictment of those who initiated it, but no less of those who were prepared to believe the accusation without being given a scrap of evidence to support its veracity. (See Appendix A) One such is, predictably, former Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn, who headed a list of signatories to the Cairo Declaration of December 18-19, 2002 which among other charges made against Israel, twice accused it of exterminating the Palestinians. (See Appendix T) Alarmed at the rise of anti-Semitism in Germany, especially virulent, as one would expect, in its rapidly growing Muslim population, in 2011, the Social Democratic Party's Friedrich Ebert Foundation commissioned a survey of attitudes towards Jews in seven European Union countries. Asked the question, is Israel waging a war of extermination against the Palestinians, those answering 'yes' were, in Italy, 38%, Holland, 39%, Hungary 41%, the UK, 42%, Germany, 48%, Portugal, 49%, and a still deeply Catholic Poland, 63%. Another survey, conducted in 2009, indicated that a staggering 10% of Poles still believed that Jews once ritually killed Christian children for their blood for mixing with the bread for the feast of the Passover, today a favourite theme of Middle Eastern TV programmes.

In a similar survey, conducted some ten years earlier by the University of Bielefeld, Germans were asked if the Israeli Jews were behaving in the same way towards the Palestinians as the Nazis had to the Jews. In this case, those agreeing with the statement amounted to 51%. For all those who inhabit the real world, and not the fictional one inhabited by pathological anti-Semites, these results are truly horrific and, for Europe's Jews, also terrifying. Let us allow that nearly all Muslims questioned would have answered 'yes' as a matter of course. Let us also concede that some of those questioned may not have been aware of the scale of the Nazi Holocaust...six million murdered out of a total of nine million European Jews...and therefore were not qualified to make an informed reply. Some, probably many more, would have been similarly ill-informed about the history of Palestinian-Israeli relations since the birth of the Jewish state in 1948. But this did not prevent them from agreeing that Israel is a genocidal state, guilty of exterminating Palestinians on a similar scale to that inflicted on the Jews by the Nazis in the last years of the Third Reich.

Had a poll on the alleged iniquities of the Jews been conducted in the Europe of the Middle Ages, or today in any Islamic country, far worse (or better, depending on one's point of view) results would no doubt have been obtained. But these two surveys were conducted in those parts of Europe that are generally regarded as the most tolerant and liberal, and in a century, the twenty first, when it is accepted by all educated people, as a matter of course, that for a claim to be accepted as true, be it scientific, legal, historical or otherwise, it must be supported by evidence that is verifiable. This is the foundation upon which both the scholarship and justice of the civilised world rests. And yet the results of these two surveys...and there have been others with similar findings...tell us that something approaching half of adult Europeans are prepared to believe the most appalling accusation it is possible to make against an entire people, without there being a single shred of evidence to support it. And we can be sure that nearly all those replying in the affirmative would have *pro forma* denied, as do the Corbynistas, harbouring any prejudice against the Jews. After all, prejudice, as the word implies, is to judge before knowing the facts of a case. So if one genuinely believes that a Jewish genocide of the Palestinians is a proven fact, then how can saying so constitute evidence of anti-Semitism? True...but then where is the evidence for a Jewish genocide of the Palestinians?

Unlike the Nazi extermination of the Jews, studied meticulously and endlessly debated by thousands of historians, related in hundreds of biographies of its main perpetrators and accounts by its witnesses and survivors, verified by millions of documentary, filmed, photographic and physical evidences, much of it presented at the Nuremberg Trials of Nazi War Criminals, and testified to in the same trials by eyewitnesses, survivors and even the perpetrators themselves, there exists not a single statistic, a *bona fide* history book or biography, a photographic image, a named perpetrator, a film, an identified location, an artefact, an eyewitness, a document, to support the claim that the Jews of Israel are exterminating the Palestinians or, at the very least, intend to do so. All we have is an assertion, repeated, *a la* Josef Goebbels, *ad nauseam*, that the Jews are guilty of the genocide of the Palestinians. Those who initiated and repeat this accusation know it is a lie. Yet millions of Europeans believe it. And most of them do not have the excuse, if such it is, that they are ignorant, anti-Semitic Muslims. Even though the Nazis carried out their Holocaust in the midst of a war, on foreign soil, unobserved by German or any other news reporting agencies, and by perpetrators sworn to secrecy, by the Second World War's end, most Germans, whether they approved of it or not, whether they participated in it or not, had found out, one way or another, that the Nazi leadership had carried out not only the murder of nearly all the Jews of Germany, but most of those of Europe.

This awareness of (not of course necessarily the responsibility for) the Holocaust by the majority of Germans has been definitively proven by the meticulous research of Eric Johnson in his *The Nazi Terror*: Genocide is by its very nature an undertaking on a scale so vast, demanding the deployment of a wide range of resources and the active involvement and acquiescence of so many civilian as well as military personnel, that it is simply impossible to keep it secret, no matter how hard its perpetrators may try to do so. Thus it was with the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews, and so it should be with the alleged Jewish Holocaust of the Palestinians, even more so because Israel, like no other state, conducts its business under the scrutiny of not only its own but the world's largely unsympathetic media, not to speak of that of its numerous political enemies. Surely, if the extermination of the Palestinians was and is proceeding on the scale so many either dishonestly claim or genuinely believe, then, given also the sophistication and proliferation of satellite and other surveillance technology, it would be impossible, *absolutely impossible*, for such a crime on such a scale to be totally concealed, especially in a country so small as Israel, and one where unlike Nazi Germany, there is no state control over the media. The same can be said of Palestinian Authority accusations that Israeli prisons have conducted Nazi-style medical experiments on convicted Palestinian terrorists. This was the claim first made by *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida*, the PA daily, on April 17, 2011, and repeated on April 12 and 13, 2015. The journal claimed to have discovered

an entire system called "slow death" [we are presumably intended to infer this is an official Israeli term] which the Israeli establishment uses against Palestinian prisoners from the moment of their arrest until they are released [sic]. The "experiments" stage is perhaps the most dangerous stage in the slow death of released prisoners, who suffer from diseases which they contract in prison. In this way, the Israeli jailers attempt to imitate the German Nazis, who were the first to use guinea pigs for testing the weapons and the deadly drugs which they developed.

And who, as we have seen, after the defeat of the Third Reich, swapped Nazi employers for Arab ones. Once again, as with the Holocaust, the reference to the Nazis (but as always, never to Hitler, the revered foe of the Jews) is made only to associate their crimes with the Jews. And also, once again, not a shred of evidence has been provided to substantiate this accusation, which is on a par with the medieval myth that Jews used and still use today (See Appendix V) the blood of murdered Christian children for mixing with the blood of Passover unleaven bread. (Dramatised depictions of this non-event are regularly screened on Arab TV networks.) Convicted Palestinian terrorists released from Israeli prisons are routinely interviewed by Palestinian TV. But when asked on PA TV on May 4, 2013, about his experiences in an Israeli jail, instead of regaling viewers with gruesome details of Nazi-style medical experimentation, one very healthy-looking released prisoner related how he and his fellow inmates would 'chat, talk, eat, drink, joke [sic] throughout the day, while another, interviewed by Fatah TV on June 24, 2010 assured viewers that 'the guys in prison are fine - they lack nothing'. A 'slow death' indeed. However, Ziyad Abu Ein, a PA deputy minister, begged to differ. Ignoring the very public testimony of his own party comrade, he claimed on Fatah TV on October 6, 2011 that conditions in Israeli prisons were 'worse than the Auschwitzes of the Nazis where Jewish detainees [sic] were held [sic]'. So, the Nazis only 'detained' and 'held' the Jews in Auschwitz (who, remember, were just stopping over on their way to the Holy Land) whereas the Jews were busy exterminating (slowly) the Palestinians in Zionist death camps disguised as prisons. If the reader will bear with me, I would like to measure the degree of depravity of this accusation by reproducing excerpts from an account, again by Max Weinreich in his *Hitler's Professors*, of experiments conducted by Nazi doctors on Jewish inmates at Auschwitz, experiments which PA Deputy Minister Ziyad Abu Ein compares *favourably* with those he claims have been carried out by Jewish doctors on Palestinians:

As befits far-sighted planning, research work was provided for from the outset. There was Scientific Department in Block 10 of Camp Oswiecim [Auschwitz] where experiments on women were carried on. Professor Schumann was interested in sterilisation by X -rays and surgical operations. he was assisted in his work by Dr. Wirths, and Dr. Bruno Webe is also mentioned in this connection. Experiments in sterilisation by the use of chemicals were conducted by Dr. Carl Clauberg; professor of gynaecology at the University of Koenigsberg...His assistant was Dr Goebel. Other scholars [sic] were engaged in mass experiments on artificial impregnation. Still another group of women were experimented on through the transplantation of cancer tissue into the uterus...From May 15 to July 30, 1944, 1,508 women were listed under that heading ['Prisoners Assigned to Different experiments']. Experiments in sterilizing and castrating men were conducted, too. Dr. Fritz Klein carried on experiments in subcutaneous injections of petroleum, etc., cut-out parts of the skin were sent to Breslau for histologic investigations. Experiments on malaria were conducted here, too...Dr Koenig, an aspiring surgeon, was fond of amputations, and used to cut off limbs which could have healed without surgery within a week or two; then the patients were SB'd [An abbreviation of the Nazi euphemism for gassing, *sonderbehandeln*, or 'special treatment']. Dr. Koenig, furthermore, engaged in mass experiments on the effect of electric current on the human brain and in this way, too, disposed of many inmates.

If it is indeed the case, as Ziyad Abu Ein claims, that Jewish doctors have surpassed Nazi depravity in their treatment of Palestinians, and would therefore use any pretext to inflict the maximum possible suffering on any Palestinian they could lay their hands on, why then, the day after three Jewish teenagers were kidnapped and then murdered by Hamas in June 2014, did Amina Abbas, wife of the PA President Mahmoud Abbas, still chose to undergo an emergency operation at the Assuto Medical Centre near Tel-Aviv? And why, in the same month, did the mother-in-law of Hamas leader Ismail Haniyeh chose to be treated by Jewish doctors at a Jerusalem hospital? And why, as the stabbing attacks on Jewish civilians incited by Fatah escalated in Jerusalem in the Autumn of 2015, did the brother-in-law of PA and Fatah President Mahmoud Abbas undergo life-saving heart surgery and his younger brother, Abu Lawi, receive cancer treatment in April 2006, both at the same Assuto Medical Centre? The moral gulf that separates a movement whose leaders incite its followers to kill Jews, that honours and commemorates those that do so, and broadcasts lies about the mistreatment of Palestinian terrorists in Israeli prisons, and a Jewish state that is prepared to do all it can to preserve the health and save the lives of these same leaders and their families, surely speaks for itself, as it does about the lies of a Israel genocide of the Palestinians. Judged by their conduct in a personal crisis, by placing their lives in the hands of those who, officially, seek their death, it is evident that the leaders of Hamas, Fatah and the Palestinian Authority do not believe their slanders against the Jews. But not only in the Middle East, where it is the default position, there are also millions in the west, as the above cited surveys prove, who are prepared to swallow any accusation, however absurd, that can be used to the blacken the reputation of Israel, even when it is the charge of genocide.

The fact that those who accuse Israel of this worst of all crimes cannot even agree amongst themselves as to when it is supposed to have taken place - some say it already has, others that it is happening now, while yet others, that it is being prepared, or, for that matter, as to why, should, one would have hoped, make anyone capable of logical thinking at least doubt the veracity of the charge. It never seems to have occurred to those who so readily believe the Jews are capable of such a crime that by now, after more than seven decades of Israel's existence, its essential details would have leaked out and become public knowledge...eye witnesses, accounts by survivors, the locations of the death camps, the methods of killing and corpse disposal, the number of victims and the identities of those responsible for their deaths, facts from which a clear picture of a Palestinian genocide could then be built up, following the same procedure employed in the preparation of the Nuremburg Trials of the major Nazi war criminals. No such evidence is forthcoming because none exists. If it did, the world would have learned about it long ago.

Strangely for a country that is supposedly in the business of mass murder, unlike a number of Islamic states, Israel does not have the death penalty, and so does not even execute terrorists convicted of multiple murder, for example Abdallah Barghouti. Fatah's Facebook page on July 22, 2013, described him as its 'heroic prisoner', currently serving a life sentence in an Israeli gaol for masterminding the murder of 67 Israeli civilians in a series of 'martyrdom operations' between 2000 and 2003. (A 'martyrdom' from which he was evidently exempt.) The only death sentence carried out on Israeli soil, under special legislation adopted in 1950 pertaining only to Nazi war crimes, was that of a fugitive Nazi war criminal, a

leading executant of the Holocaust and intimate associate of the Grand Mufti, SS Lieutenant Colonel Adolf Eichmann, who was executed on June 1, 1962.

If it indeed is the case that Israel has done to the Palestinians what the Nazis did to the Jews, then approximately two thirds of the Palestinians who, in one way or another, to one extent or another, have lived under Israeli jurisdiction, must have been put to death by Israel as a deliberate act of genocide. That and that alone, is the sense in which the two surveys put the question and, one has to assume, it was also answered. Some statistics, most stemming from Palestinian sources, demonstrate how absurd the accusation of a Jewish genocide of the Palestinians is. All told, as of 2023, there were around 14 million Palestinians living in the Middle East. Five million came under the Palestinian Authority in the Gaza Strip (left by Israel in 2005 and from 2006, ruled by Hamas) and the West Bank. Another six million live in other Arab territories, mainly Jordan, Syria and Lebanon; and finally, 2 million in Israel. Leaving aside for the moment this last group, let us focus on those who from 1967 lived in the Gaza Strip up until 2005 and in the West Bank until now (2023), both having been under Israeli administration of one kind or another since 1967, and who therefore, if the accusations are in any way true, would have been obvious potential victims of the Israeli's extermination programme.

In 1970, the population of Gaza stood at 0.34 million. In 2023 it was 2.1 million. That of the West Bank was 0.69 million. As of 2023, it was three million. So, in the two territories combined, there had been a *fourfold increase* in a little over four decades. Yet one can read on the website *Pakistan Defence* that '5,100,000 Palestinians have been killed [by the Israelis that is] since 1948.' And yet Pakistan's population growth rate is substantially less than that of Palestinians in the Gaza Strip, the West Bank and Israel. If genocide and 'mass murder' is, as claimed, not only Israel's intention, but, we are assured by Pakistanis, Nazis, clergymen, the Sharia left and UK Muslim pressure groups, actually has been and is still now 'ongoing', is being carried out 'every single day', (Seumas Milne, Corbyn's one-time press officer, says 'on an industrial scale') then those who make these claims need to explain how the populations of the territories where it is supposedly being carried out have experienced, from 1970 till now, growth rates not only greatly exceeding those of any western country, but are also above the growth rate of the rest of the Arab peoples, and, mark this, above the country allegedly carrying out the genocide. Currently, the Israeli Jewish growth rate is 1.8%, that of Israel's Arabs 2.2%, and those of the West Bank and Gaza, 2.5%. Truly a genocide with a difference, one might say

Just how much credence Fatah and Hamas place in their accusations of Israeli genocide of the Palestinians is demonstrated by the transfer to Israeli hospitals of upwards of 100,000 Palestinians a year from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip for specialist treatment in Israeli hospitals that the PA is unable to provide itself, while their Muslim brothers in Iran and the oil-rich states of the Gulf prefer to supply the means to kill Jews rather than fund those that enhance and save Palestinian lives. As we have seen, even the wife of the Holocaust-denying PA President Mahmoud Abbas chose to place herself under the medical care of Israeli Jewish doctors, at a Tel Aviv clinic in June 2014, rather than those of her own faith and nation. The above-average growth rates of the Palestinian populations living under Israeli administration after the June war of 1967 is in part due to the huge infrastructural investment programmes undertaken by the Israelis in the two territories that had been illegally occupied since 1949, and then criminally neglected, by Jordan in the

West Bank and by Egypt in the Gaza Strip. Starting in 1967, in the West Bank, Israel established six universities where previously there were none. Roads were constructed, hospitals and schools built, sewage treatment and water supply plants installed, and telephone and radio networks provided. In Gaza, it was the same. All this, to facilitate *genocide*? Let us subject this claim to a simple mathematical test, one which those who endorse it, never do. After one year of the Gaza war, Hamas claimed that it had led to the death of approximately 40,000 Palestinians, though this number does not differentiate between civilians, who are counted as genocide victims, and military personnel, who are not. But even if we include the latter, the percentage of just Gaza Palestinians killed by Israel computes at less than 1.5, compared to the 60% of European Jews who died in the Holocaust. But since Israel is accused of a genocide of 'the Palestinians' as such, not just those of Gaza, this percentage shrinks to around 0.3.

Then there is a very obvious question arising from the above well known facts which never receives an answer, partly at least because those who should ask it never do. If the intention is to exterminate the Palestinians, since this is what genocide entails, why, since 1967, did Israel devote so much of its scarce resources and small labour force to improving the quality of life of those it was either exterminating, or, at the very least, intended to exterminate? In the first 25 years of Israeli occupation, the annual rate of increase of the GDP of the two territories, after decades, even centuries of stagnation, varied between seven and thirteen per cent. How did this further what is said to be Israel's goal of a Palestinian genocide?

Then, in 1994, with the formation of the Palestinian Authority under the terms of the Oslo Accords of the previous year, and its assumption of responsibility for economic and social policy, there came a new stagnation, followed by steep decline and vast corruption, only partly compensated, but also partly caused, by massive injections of UN aid, much of which never found its way to those for whom it was intended. So it is not hard to see why, in the midst of the corruption, chaos, factional violence and poverty that became the lot of the mass of Palestinians, their leaders needed a scapegoat for and diversion from the consequences of their own misrule. To again paraphrase Voltaire, if the Jews did not exist, it would be necessary to invent them. But Abbas did not have to invent them. There they were, just across the Green Line and behind their wall, plotting and carrying out, so his captive media assures his people, the genocide of the Palestinians: 'You think we are bad? You should try living under the Jews.' The irony is, many have, and as we shall see, they prefer it to what passes for life under the corrupt, terrorism-promoting kleptocracies headed by Fatah in the West Bank and Hamas in the Gaza Strip.

In the West, the Sharia left has taken upon itself the task of recycling, embellishing and amplifying the genocide lie and, as we have seen, has done so with considerable success. The crime of genocide, as every politically literate person knows, is the actual or attempted, deliberate, physical destruction of an entire people. All reputable dictionaries provide the same definition, so one example should suffice. That of *Chambers* runs thus: 'Genocide: The deliberate [n.b.] extermination of a racial, national, religious or ethnic group.' Except for those who deny the Holocaust, that this definition of 'genocide' applies to the Nazis is incontestable. Then follows the definition of a word derived from genocide, namely, 'genocidist', that reads thus: 'Genocidist: a person who exterminates, or approves of the extermination of, a race, etc.'. Both Hamas and Hezbollah, to name but two of

several Islamic movements (and also in the case of Hamas, since 2006, its regime) not only approve of the genocide of the Jews but, as we have seen, quite openly proclaims their intention to bring it about. Intent necessarily comprises an integral part of the act of genocide, for without intent, it will not happen. Thus Hezbollah and Hamas are genocidal movements, and those who rule them are, accordingly, genocidists. But to countless millions of Muslims and infidel leftists, they are heroes. Article II of the United Nations Convention on Genocide, adopted unanimously on December 9, 1948, says: 'In the present Convention, genocide means any one of the following acts [the first listed being 'killing'] committed with intent [n.b.] to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group'. There we have it: 'with intent to destroy'. Hamas undeniably kills Jews with the intention of furthering its stated goal of killing all Jews, though it is too much to hope the anti-Israel UN 'Human Rights' Council will indict Hamas for violating Article II of its own Convention on Genocide. It prefers instead to indict Israel for defending itself against this very crime. (See Appendix G) On what evidence does its accusation rest that Israel's conduct in the 2014 Gaza conflict was proof of genocidal intentions towards the Palestinian people? If we stay within the limits of the above definitions of genocide, for Israel to be guilty of genocide, one of three propositions must be proven to be true:

- 1) Israel has already carried out, or is currently carrying out, like the Nazi 'final solution', a substantial, even if not total extermination of the Palestinians;
- 2) Israel has attempted or is attempting to carry out the above, but for whatever reason(s), has thus far failed to do so;
- 3) Israel has not yet attempted to exterminate the Palestinians but plans to do so at some time in the future.

Now, instead of fantasy, some more demographic facts, the only basis on which the first charge of an actual, rather than a failed or intended genocide can be either validated or refuted. The population of Gaza before the Hamas-Israel war of 2014, was approximately 1.8 million. At its end, it still stood at 1.8 million and has since remained, despite the alleged genocide, the 13th fastest growing population of any state in the world. The number of Gaza deaths, civilian and military, according to claims made by Hamas and re-cycled uncritically by the world's media and human rights organisations, was reported as being in the region of 2,000; that is, around 0.1.% of the total Gaza population of 1,800,000. Even if we take this figure as accurate, it is reasonable to assume that at least half of those killed were Hamas fighters. Given their well-advertised readiness, even eagerness to die as martyrs to the anti-Zionist cause, it would be strange indeed if an army motivated by such high ideals allowed the civilians it was protecting, especially children, to die in greater numbers than its own fighters...unless of course it deliberately placed them in the firing line as 'human shields' while itself cowering in tunnels dug by these same children. (See Chapter 2 for proof that it did] Casting aside, as we must, such slurs on the manhood, honour and courage of Hamas Jihadis, let us then assume that civilian casualties amounted to half the total, always bearing mind that this number would be zero if Hamas had not murdered three Jewish students and then unilaterally launched its rocket attack on Israel in July 2014. So, 1,000 civilian deaths take us down to a percentage of a little under 0.06...not exactly the stuff of genocide. Contrary to the claims of Muslim and infidel Holocaust deniers, the Nazis

murdered six million of Europe's nine million Jews, a percentage a thousand times greater than that of the Israeli 'genocide' of Palestinian civilians in the summer of 2014.

If indeed Israel intended to commit genocide against the Palestinians, why did its armed forces withdraw from the Gaza Strip after the completion of operation Protective Edge? If the motive for the invasion was the indiscriminate killing of as many Palestinians as possible, and not the neutralisation of Hamas terror attacks, why did the Israelis not carry on with the killing? An obvious question one would think. But wait. Perhaps there is after all evidence of how the Jews conduct their genocide of the Palestinians. Or at least the official Palestinian News Agency would have us believe so, for on May 21, 2001, it carried the following item: 'Israel is starting a new [sic...new?...surely one should suffice] genocide against the Palestinian people by poisoning them, using candy [sweet] bags dropped from airplanes.' This fantasy is on a par with another claim that the Israelis had been poisoning the West Bank's water supply system, a modern variant on the medieval myth that Jews poisoned wells. And yet another of the same genre: 'I have seen [Palestinian] children with three arms, four legs and two heads, the most abnormal results of pollution you could imagine'. Like the numerous sightings of the Lock Ness monster, what a pity the witness had no access to a camera. As for proofs that plans exist for an as yet to be implemented genocide of Palestinians...again, nothing.

Leaving aside the always unanswered question as to why the Israelis should want to devote so much of their resources, energies, skills and time putting to death millions of Palestinians, if the Jews of Israel really do harbour genocidal intentions towards the Palestinians, as their enemies claim, then surely such a 'final solution' would begin, like Hitler's of the Jews did in Germany, by targeting those defenceless and readily-accessible Palestinians living within Israel's borders, and who are therefore under direct Israeli rule. The first census of the newly-founded state of Israel counted 156,00 Arabs, most being Palestinians. By 2022, the number of Arabs living within Israel, that is, excluding the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, had risen to 2.1 million, thereby not only defying all the efforts of those who were vainly trying to exterminate them, but exceeding their own growth rate by a factor of two. This rate of increase, exceeding by far that of any other Arab state, is certainly the opposite of what one would expect if indeed the Israelis had been living up to their reputation as efficient and ruthless genocidists, operating on an 'industrial scale'. (The author of this lie, *Guardian* journalist Seamus Milne, later served as Corbyn's 'Director of Communications', or as Orwell would have called it, 'Ministry of Truth'.)

Demographic factors obviously played the major part in this spectacular growth, together with Israel's vastly superior, compared to its Arab neighbours, health service and general quality of life. But another factor was substantial inward Palestinian migration, legal and otherwise, into Israel from surrounding Arab territories, while there was scarcely any movement in the opposite direction. Could these Palestinians have been so stupid that they preferred to move to and live in a state which, so their leaders never tired of telling them, had them marked down for extermination? Why were the Palestinians of Israel not fleeing in the opposite direction, to Arab lands, to escape the clutches of their executioners? If we were to believe Corbynista Nads Hussain's claim that 'the whole of Israel is nothing but a terrorist camp', then the answer must be yes, they are either that stupid, or afflicted with a death wish, because its Palestinian inmates seem to have no desire to leave

it, even though they are free to do so whenever they like. More than that, as surveys have established, it is the envy of their fellow Palestinians living elsewhere.

Consider as proof of this the following: In 2000, in furtherance of the proposed 'two state solution', a land swap agreement was mooted which would, by means of small border adjustments, facilitate the mutual transfer of a Jewish community living east of the Israel-West Bank border (the 'Green Line') to Israel, and the Palestinian settlement of Wadi Ara on its west side to the rule of the Palestinian Authority. When consulted on their reactions to this proposal, 82% of Palestinians opposed the plan, preferring to remain in the Jewish 'terrorist camp' under the rule of the Zionist genocidists. Another 6% expressed no opinion, while a mere 11% favoured transfer to the PA. Of those preferring Israel, 54% gave as their reason the state's democratic political system and high living standards, 18% expressed general satisfaction with life in Israel, while another 14% said they did not wish to make such a sacrifice for the Palestinian cause. 6% gave no reason. Unless one is blinded by hatred of Israel and its Jews, it is easy to see, so easy a child could work it out in a trice, that the Palestinians of Wadi Ara, like those in the rest of Israel, have understood without any difficulty which side of their bread is best buttered. All the facts prove beyond any doubt that Israeli Palestinians are, by a wide margin, freer, healthier, safer, better fed, paid, educated and housed not only than any other Arabs in the Middle East, but *Muslims in the entire Islamic world*. And they know it. Even the official Palestinian Authority daily, *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida*, which in the normal run of things, never had a good word to say about Israel and the Jews, carried a feature on September 21, 2014, that is, be it noted, in the wake of the Gaza-Israeli war, which frankly admitted that working and living conditions for Palestinians employed by Israelis were vastly superior in every respect to those employed by fellow Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza:

Whenever Palestinian workers have the opportunity to work for Israeli employers, they are quick to quit their jobs with their Palestinian employers for reasons to do with salaries and other rights...The Israel work conditions are very good, and include transportation, medical insurance and pensions. These things do not exist with Palestinian employers.

We can also add for the benefit of UK trade union leaders who support the boycotting of Israel and the expulsion of its trade union movement, Histadrut, from the International Trade Union Confederation, but have no problem with Islamic states that outlaw labour organisations, that Israel legally protects the right to strike, and its trade unions organise and represent both Jewish and Arab workers. A study funded by the European Union and conducted by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics confirmed the comparison made by *Al-Hayat*. It found that in the period between October and December 2014, the average daily wage paid to Palestinians working in Israel was 194.2 Shekels, compared with 91.4 in the West Bank, and, in the Hamas-ruled Gaza Strip, 66.1. No wonder Palestinians preferred working for and with Jews rather than under or for a regime whose one aim was to exterminate them. How many active in the boycott Israel campaign were aware of these findings? Yet they were all acknowledged to be true by the Palestinian Authority itself, giving the lie to Sharia left claims of Zionist genocide, apartheid and exploitation of the Palestinian people. (See Appendix K for more details)

Capitalist exploitation and corruption at its very worst is rife in the West Bank and Gaza. Both are ruled by super rich politicians. The personal fortune of PA President Mahmood Abbas has been rated at \$100 million and the two absentee Hamas supremos, Musa Marzook and Khaled Mashaal, both at more than two \$billion, much of it filched from United Nations 'aid programmes'. The contrast with Israel is just as great in matters political. According to the Palestinian Authority's own regulations, elections to the Authority's Legislative Council must be held every four years. As of 2024, the most recent was held 18 years previously, in 2006. The election scheduled for 2010 never took place, neither did those for 2014, 2018 and 2022. The prospects for one in the near future were just as bleak, with Fatah and Hamas each conveniently blaming the other for the delay. Presidential elections are also by law to be held every four years. The last was in 2005, which brought the current incumbent, Mahmoud Abbas to power. This effective abolition of elections in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip has passed without comment by the world's media and, what is more to the point, by the politicians of those countries (as of 2019, 138) who have recognised the PA as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Meanwhile, in Israel, Palestinians not only have the same voting rights as Jews but have the opportunity to exercise them regularly. In the period between 2006 and 2022, during which time under the PA there had been no elections, in Israel, there had been nine, including two in the same year, in 2019 and 2021, a contrast which has led a Palestinian journalist from Ramallah to comment that 'we say bad things about Israel, but at least the people there vote and have the right to enjoy democracy. We really envy the Israelis. [sic] Our leaders don't want elections. They want to remain in power for ever.' Currently, the average age of the PA's unelected officialdom is the middle eighties. Allah willing, and with the assistance of Israel's health service, it will continue to rise.

While western media coverage of the Middle East almost always accepts at face value casualty figures provided by Palestinian terrorist organisations, as was case in the Gaza conflicts of 2008-9, 2012, 2014, 2021 and 2023-4, each initiated by Hamas, the number of Israeli Jews killed by these same terrorist groups is not regarded as so newsworthy, being, as some say of black-on-black murder in the USA, the 'wrong narrative'. Since the creation of Israel in 1948, excluding military deaths in battles against Arab invaders, the number of Jews killed by terrorists as of 2022, was 3,198. The number killed in 2022 was 24, even though one would never have known it if one had relied purely on media reports, which invariably focus on Israel's retaliatory measures against those doing the killing. It was in order to reduce the number and severity of these attacks that the Israeli government decided to construct its much-decried security wall along sections of the border between Israel and the West Bank. This decision had not been taken lightly, because it was hoped that with the conclusion of the Oslo Accords in 1993, in which the PLO agreed to end its terror attacks, accept and recognise the state of Israel, and to work with Israel towards a 'two state solution', the killing of Jews would stop, or at least be substantially reduced.

In fact, the opposite happened. From the signing of the Oslo Accords in September 1993 to the virtual completion of the wall in December 2005, the number of Jews killed by terrorist actions was approximately 1,400. This carnage went by the name of the 'Middle East Peace Process'. In the west, anti-Zionists likened the Israeli security wall to the Berlin wall constructed on the orders of Moscow by its

puppet East German regime in August 1961. (In fairness, Corbyn top aid, the Stalinist Andrew Murray, should not be saddled with this false comparison, since he mourned the Wall's passing as 'a huge set-back for human progress.') There is, however, one small problem with this analogy. The purpose of the Berlin wall, *pace* Murray, was to prevent East Berliners escaping to the west. Israel built its wall, not to keep its Jews in, (that is, to prevent them from escaping to regimes which harboured movements that wanted them dead) but to keep the terrorists who wanted to murder them, out. And, much to the chagrin of frustrated Jihadis and suicide bombers, it worked.

Between 2000 and July 2003, when work on the wall began, 73 suicide bombers were responsible for 293 Israeli civilian deaths and 1,800 wounded. In just one year, 2002, terrorist attacks claimed 452 lives. Once construction of the wall began, the number of attacks began to fall. Between August 2003 and 2006, twelve suicide bombers killed 64 civilians and wounded 445. As the wall was extended to its current length of nearly 300 miles, so the number of attacks fell, along with the number of casualties. Yet anti-Zionists claimed that the purpose of the wall was not to curb terrorism (though why Israel would not want to do this was never explained) but to further its policy of apartheid. It was as if Israel, unlike any other sovereign state, had no right to protect its citizens from murderous attacks by their country's enemies, or control the movement of people and goods across its borders. People and goods did in fact continue to move across the border between Israel and the West Bank, but for obvious reasons, under conditions of heightened security. Here too double standards are in evidence. US President Trump's stated intention to extend his country's wall along the border with Mexico attracted much criticism from the left, even though its construction began, without any such objections, under one Democratic administration, Clinton's, in 1994, and continued under another, Obama's, from 2009 to 2017. Furthermore, enforcing his maxim that the USA was 'a country of laws', Obama deported more illegal immigrants than any previous or subsequent President, some three million. No one on the left objected to the 700-kilometre wall Iran erected on its border with Pakistan, or Turkey's 800-kilometre wall along its border with Syria. Likewise, when it comes to 'occupations' and illegal annexations, no one on the far left, despite its hatred of all things American, has campaigned for the return to Mexico of the vast territories annexed by the USA after the war of 1846-8, which more than halved the size of Mexico from 1,700,000 square miles to 800,000, or, for that matter, demanded independence from the USA for Guam, Samoa, Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands, or a BDS-style boycott of the USA for its refusal to return Guantanamo to Cuba. Then there are the fruits of England's 'colonial settlements' in North American, and Australasia, each accompanied by the near extermination of their native population. Once again, Israel, which has not annexed the West Bank and withdrew from the Gaza Strip in 2005, is judged by criteria that apply to no other country, not even the Great Satan itself.

Understandably, Israel's Jihadi enemies were only too aware of the real purpose of the wall, and consequently could not conceal their chagrin and frustration at its success. Speaking on the Al Manar TV channel in November 2006, the Islamic *Jihad* leader Ramada Shalah complained that 'if it [the wall] were not there, the situation would be entirely different'. Yes indeed! There would be many more Jewish corpses. What was meant by 'the situation' was made clear in an interview Shalah gave to the Qatar journal *Al Sharq*, published on March 23, 2008: 'The wall

limits the ability of the resistance [sic] to arrive deep within Israeli territory to carry out suicide attacks'. So, the wall had nothing to do with an Israeli 'apartheid'. The problem was it stopped Jihadis killing Jews. If that constitutes a war crime, or a violation of Jihadi human rights, so be it. Because for certain, killing Jews is the prime Jihadi objective, not merely the elimination of the state of Israel. And no attempt is made to disguise it. On July 25 2014, at the height of the war against Israel, the Hamas Al-Aqsa TV network broadcast a Friday sermon at a Gaza mosque in which the preacher warned the Jews that 'our doctrine is that we will totally exterminate you.' The religion of peace.

The prospect of another genocide of the Jews however was the last concern of pro-Hamas marchers in London, who held aloft posters and banners comparing Gaza to Auschwitz and Dachau, while others on the same march proclaimed their admiration for Hitler. (See Chapter 1) Instead, the Sharia left slander offensive went into overdrive when Moshe Feiglin, an extreme right-wing member of the Israeli parliament, proposed in a letter to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu that Gaza Palestinians should be interned in concentration camps, and the entire Gaza Strip annexed and incorporated into Israel. In reporting the proposal, the *Daily Mail* described Feiglin as an 'official', without adding that his 'official' post was of one of no fewer than ten deputy speakers in the Israeli parliament, and therefore not a member of the government. Apart from his advocacy of the legalisation of cannabis, Feiglin's stance on all other social issues, such as gay rights, the status of women, and the role of religion in social and political life, closely resembled that of Israel's Islamic neighbours and enemies. As such, he had always been regarded as a maverick on the fringes of Israel's political scene. Like all his other initiatives, his proposal to intern Hamas fighters and supporters fell on deaf ears. This did not prevent one US news agency, *National Report*, claiming that after what it described as a 'closed door vote' by the Israeli parliament, 'the Israeli government has begun [sic] the construction of several [sic] strategically placed concentration camps outside the Gaza Strip' and approved the 'eviction of the Palestinian people from Gaza'. In a matter of hours, the transition had been effected from an ignored proposal by a political nobody to intern Arabs in concentrations camps to not one, but 'several' such camps being already under construction after their authorisation by a not very well concealed 'closed door vote' by the Israeli parliament, and the deportation of the entire population of the Gaza Strip, numbering 1.8 million, to forced resettlement in Egypt, in batches of 'twenty thousand people at a time'.

Such reporting was ready-made grist to the mill of the *dhimmi* left. The SWP's online *Socialist Worker* of August 7, 2014, contrived to conjure out of Feiglin's solitary letter not only 'open calls [now in the plural] for concentration camps' but also for 'genocide', calls that were said to be 'echoing around Israeli society'. Like the calls for a genocide of the Jews that feature on Arab TV broadcasts perhaps? But it was more than just an echo. In the same story, readers were assured that 'Israel's Jewish population [not, be it noted, Government] ...stands ready to justify every last atrocity [sic] committed by Israel in the last month', including, it was claimed, the use of Palestinian children as human shields. (For, together with others on the far left, Corbyn's illegal approval of human shields, see Chapter 2)

Here we have, fully developed, and perfectly attuned to the Jew-hatred of the Sharia left's Muslim allies, the indicting of an *entire people*, Israel's seven million Jews, for desiring and endorsing what Israel's accusers know to be the myth of the

genocide of the Palestinian people. Here too is the proof that the Sharia left's hatred is directed not just against the Israeli government, but all the country's Jews, and, by extension, diaspora Jews, the vast majority of whom believe, as I, a non-Jew do, that irrespective of its government's policies, Israel has a right under international law, just like any other state, to live in peace within secure borders, and until its neighbours agree to let it do so, to defend itself from external attack. But the two terrorist movements championed by the Sharia left, Hamas and Hezbollah, quite openly seek totally different goals, not only the destruction of Israel, whatever its borders, but the extermination of its Jewish population, a 'final solution' which, if we understand the *Socialist Worker* aright, the collective guilt of the Jews of Israel has brought upon themselves. This is how 'news' about the foul deeds of the evil Zionists is manufactured and put into circulation around the world, there to be taken up as good coin.

There is another angle to this story that merits exploration. The *National Report* item concluded by claiming that Israel's (mythical) programme of concentration camp construction 'has been met with an outraged outcry by leaders of the Arab world, who likened it to the very horrible acts perpetrated on the Jewish people by Germany in World War Two'. Jewish Nazis...again. And on this occasion, they would have had a point, had the story not been a total fabrication. But there is another aspect to this tale that is not pure fiction. There were indeed camps in the Middle East holding huge numbers of Palestinians, but they were not built and administered by Israelis. The truth was, and every 'Arab leader' knew it, that the only Palestinians held in camps, segregated, without civil rights, work, or citizenship, and who would die of disease or starvation but for mainly western-funded aid, were and still are located, not in Israel, but in the West Bank and Lebanon, Jordan and Syria. But of this crime, not a word from the Sharia left, because the perpetrators of this system of segregation, if not strictly apartheid, imposed on Palestinians are Arabs and Muslims, not Jews.

Here we have yet another case of double standards. Deploying the Goebbels propaganda technique that the bigger lie, and the more often it is repeated, the better, Israel's enemies search for the dirtiest sticks they can find to beat the Jews of Israel. One that comes readily to hand is to accuse Israel of practising apartheid, a charge that together with genocide, has long served as a staple slander for opponents of Zionism, whatever their political provenance. Every year, anti-Zionists at universities in the USA and the UK, with the enthusiastic participation of student Islamic societies and staff, stage an 'Israeli Apartheid Week' in which any number of totally unfounded allegations are made about the segregation in Israel of Jews and Arabs. As in the case of the term 'Nazi', in what is best described, after Orwell, as 'Shariaspeak', the word apartheid is used to describe an Israel that has not the remotest connection with reality and can only exist in minds warped by a hatred of all things Jewish. Apartheid, as every politically literate person knows, is the legally enforced segregation of populations according to racial, religious, gender or other criteria. Until the advent of apartheid in South Africa, only the Jews and the black population of some southern US states had been subject to segregation laws. After centuries of persecution, discrimination and pogroms, by an edict of the Roman Catholic Church issued in 1555, Jews were confined to enclosed areas that became known as ghettos. No such segregation exists or has ever existed in Israel and, again, its critics know it, because they have never been able, when challenged, to produce the evidence that it does or has. Israeli Arabs freely mingle with Jews

socially, and have the same legal, language, educational, cultural, religious, employment and voting rights as Jews. Arabic and Hebrew are the two recognised languages of Israel. Unlike all Arab states bar Lebanon and Syria, there is no state-imposed religion. Even Israel's worst enemies have never denied that Muslims are totally free to practice their religion, a freedom rarely if ever extended to Jews in Arab or other Islamic states. Of the 120 members of the 2015 Israeli Parliament, 18 were Arabs, 14 representing Wamab, the joint Arab list and third largest party in the Knesset. Arab parties have not only supported governments of the Left but, following the election of 2021, together with the Labour Party, entered an eight-party coalition government. Is this how apartheid operated in South Africa?

One of the Israeli parliament's recent Deputy Speakers was a Palestinian, Ahamas Tibi, an outspoken critic of Zionism. A Palestinian Judge, Salim Joubran, sat in Israel's Supreme Court. The Deputy Inspector General of the Israeli Police...yes, *police*...was also an Arab. Five Arabs have served as ambassadors to foreign states. Arabs share membership of the Israeli Trade unions with Jews and participate in sports teams nationally and internationally. As of 2020, five of Israel's football team, including its captain, were Palestinians. In matters sexual, Israel, unlike in the rest of the Middle East, or indeed in the wider Arab and Muslim worlds, Israel is the only country that does not punish women for adultery, or persecute members of LGBT communities, what anti-Zionists call 'pink washing', while remaining silent about the fates they suffer under Islam. Just imagine a Gay Pride march in Corbyn's former employer, Iran, where homosexuals are hanged or hurled from tall building, In Iran's (and Corbyn's) greatest enemy, every year on the streets of Tel Aviv, more than 200,000 Jews celebrate the rights of gays.

Lacking any evidence that within Israel itself there is any legal segregation of, or discrimination against Arabs, anti-Zionists claim that the proof of an Israeli apartheid is to be found in the construction of the security wall between Israel and the West Bank, beginning in 2003. We have already established that the real purpose of the wall was well understood by those whom it was built to keep out. So we ask those who in the West claim to see in its construction and operation a policy of apartheid: has its construction segregated Jews from Palestinians? Each live, as they did before on either side of the wall. There is, as before, regulated access by both Jews and Palestinians to both Israel and the West Bank, only now it takes place at a reduced number of check points along the length of the wall, just as it does in other countries with shared borders, with the one exception of the members states of the European Union, which, which, except for the pre-Brexit UK, allows unregulated internal movement within its borders under the terms of the Schengen Treaty. All states have and, if they choose, can exercise a legal right, under international law, to control movements of goods and people across their borders. Only when Israel does this is it a cause for accusations of racism.

Ranged on both sides of the debate concerning a so-called Israeli apartheid are those who were united in their struggle against the genuine South African version. I ask the reader to compare the following two responses to the accusation of Israeli apartheid, and ask themselves, based on the evidence they either cite or fail to, which is closer to the reality of the status of Arabs in present-day Israel:

I am a South African who lived through apartheid. I have no hesitation in saying that Israel's crimes are infinitely [sic] worse than those committed by the apartheid regime of South Africa. (Ronnie Kasrils of the Communist Party of South Africa)

The Arabs of Israel are full citizens. Crucially they have the vote [unlike non-whites in apartheid South Africa] and Israeli Arabs MPs sit in parliament. [unlike non-whites in apartheid South Africa] An Arab judge sits on the country's highest court [unlike in white-only courts in apartheid South Africa]; an Arab is chief surgeon at a leading hospital [all hospitals were racially segregated in apartheid South Africa]; an Arab commands a brigade of the Israeli army [apartheid South Africa's army was whites only]; others head university departments. [Apartheid South Africa's educational system was racially segregated]. Arab and Jewish babies are born in the same delivery rooms attended by the same doctors and nurses and mothers recover in adjoining beds. [Ditto] Jews and Arabs travel on the same trains, taxis and yes - buses. Universities, theatres, cinemas, beaches, restaurants are open to all. [unlike apartheid South Africa]. (Jailed anti-apartheid campaigner Benjamin Pogrund.)

If one is genuinely seeking examples of genuine apartheid one need look no further than the despotic kingdom of Saudi Arabia, or Taliban Afghanistan, where Sharia law enforces a ruthless segregation of the sexes and renders women virtually invisible as second class subjects, the property of their male relatives; or Syria, Lebanon and Jordan, where Palestinians are herded into South African Bantustan-style reservations, deprived of political rights and isolated from the rest of the surrounding Arab populations. In the case of Lebanon, laws have been enacted which bar Palestinians from employment in no fewer than 36 occupations, without any protest from either UNRWA, whose sole task it is to care for the welfare of the Palestinians, or Sharia leftists, who normally seize every opportunity to vaunt their loyalty to the Palestinian cause. No such laws exist in 'apartheid Israel'. Impossible as it may be for anti-Zionists to accept it, the truth is that the country where Palestinians have most political and civil rights is Israel. And what is more, whatever their false friends in the west might claim to the contrary, it needs to be repeated: however much they may hate the Jews, the Palestinians know it and, given the opportunity, vote for it with their feet.

Before accusing Israel of forcibly imposing apartheid on the Palestinians, those who do so should look a little more closely at the self-segregation practised by Muslims in the Islamic diaspora. In an increasing number of cities across Europe, Muslims have been allowed and even encouraged to create virtually self-contained 'communities' that aside from their readiness to utilise the provision of state benefits and public services such as health and education, choose to have little if any dealings or contact with the host society that provides them, as more than one Muslim commentator has acknowledged and deplored. (See Chapters 17, 26 and 27) Today, in Denmark, Sweden, Belgium, Germany, and France, there are areas of cities which not only *kuffar* civilians but even armed police regard and treat as 'no go' enclaves, ruled in many cases by armed criminal Muslim gangs, as in Brussels, Malmo and Marseille. Europe is heading towards a two-tier society, a network of states within a state, and the government-approved operation of Sharia courts in the UK, and in Germany, Sharia-derived rulings by courts and judges, are steps in that direction, creating a system of either officially or tacitly sanctioned apartheid practised strictly in accordance with the *Koran's* injunction that 'ye who believe should not take the Jews and Christians as friends'. (5:52)

9 Baby Killers...but whose babies?

‘Israeli forces are happy [sic] to kill children.’ BBC presenter Anjana Gadgil in an interview with former Israeli Prime Minister Naftali Bennett, June 5, 2023.

On Thursday, October 12, 2023, explicit images of bloodied and burned babies and children’s rooms covered in blood and gunpowder were published on the official accounts of the State of Israel and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, on X, formerly Twitter.

One of the chants frequently heard on anti-Israeli demonstrations over the years has been ‘baby killers’. It was also the headline of the September 2014 number of *European Socialist Action*, a monthly published by the veteran Mosleyite, Robert Edwards. Like the Sharia left, the UN, and most of the world’s media, it accused Israel of committing ‘sadistic war crimes’ in its war against Hamas, yet another instance of the far left and right uniting in their shared hatred of the Jewish state. Edwards had been a guest on Iran’s Press TV, the same channel frequented by Sharia leftists Corbyn, Livingstone and Galloway, and a galaxy of far rightists and anti-Semites. It was also another case of the anti-Zionist pot calling the Israeli kettle black. On May 16, 1974, Palestinian terrorists took 90 pupils and staff hostage at a school in the Israeli town of Maalot. While negotiations were being conducted for their release by French and Romanian diplomatic intermediaries, the terrorists opened fire on their captives, killing sixteen children and wounding another 90 staff and pupils. Seven days later Israeli security forces captured six Palestinian terrorists in the act of preparing another hostage-taking of Jewish children. On March 13, 1997, a Jordanian soldier, Ahmed Duqamseh, killed seven Israeli schoolchildren and wounded six more who were on a field trip on the Israeli side of the Israel-Jordan border. Speaking on Al Jazeera TV in May 2001, Duqamseh’s mother praised her son for his ‘heroic deed’, one that had ‘pleased God’, adding, ‘I am proud of any Muslim that does what Ahmed did’. Duqamseh, jailed for 20 years by a Jordanian military tribunal, subsequently declared that he had ‘no regrets’. The only thing that angered him was his gun, ‘which did not work properly. Otherwise, I would have killed all of the passengers on the bus.’

Six children aged 15, 12, 6, 5, 1 and five months, were among 11 victims of (Nobel Peace Prize winner) Arafat’s Fatah in Jerusalem on March 2, 2002 and 16 teenagers of a Hamas suicide attack on the Tel-Aviv Dolphinarium discotheque on June 1, 2001. On March 6, 2008, eight Jerusalem students were mowed down by Kalashnikov-wielding Palestinian terrorists in their college’s library. Eleven other students were wounded. On August 18, 2011, seven Israeli civilians were murdered in a series of terrorist attacks north of Eilat. On November 17, 2014, two Palestinian cousins entered a Jerusalem synagogue and murdered two rabbis and five other civilians. On October 22 of the same year, a mother and her baby of three months were killed when deliberately run over by a car driven by a known Palestinian terrorist. These ‘operations’ were just a small sample of scores of similar lethal terrorist attacks on Jewish Israeli civilians, some of which, as in those above, included the killing of children and babies. And yet it is Israel, as we all are well

aware, that is repeatedly accused of deliberately targeting civilians, including babies, in the course of its military operations against those that seek its destruction. Those who make this accusation know it is a lie, and they include those who themselves justify and even demand the killing of Jewish children in their *Jihad* against Israel.

Islam, as we know, is invariably depicted as a or even the 'religion of peace' by politicians ranging from Robert Edwards on the far right through Tory P.M. Cameron and his former deputy Liberal Democrat Nick Clegg to the furthest of the far left, not to speak of clerics of any number of denominations, some of which are themselves the victims of Islamic atrocities. Since they all claimed to speak with authority on the subject of Islam, how come none of them seemed aware of the *Koran's* repeated summons to the faithful to wage *Jihad* against unbelievers? (See Appendix L) How could they not know, since the facts of the matter are not hard to come by, that when Hamas kidnaps or targets civilian areas with rockets, slaughters Jews at prayer and dining in restaurants, pedestrians in crowded streets, or targets passengers on buses with suicide bombers, it also does so with the expressed approval of Islamic clerical authorities far better versed in the *Koran* and the *hadith* than any infidel politician or clergyman?

To take but one example of several, a prominent cleric at the prestigious Al-Azhar University of Cairo, Sheikh Muhammad Sayyid Tantawi. He ruled in 2002 that 'every martyrdom operation against any Israeli, including children, women and teenagers, is a legitimate act according to religious law and an Islamic commandment.' To repeat, for those who defend or deny the illegal 'human shield' tactics of Hamas but accuse Israel of targeting children: '*...including children, women and teenagers*'. This ruling was entirely in accordance with Islamic teachings, most notably those to be found in the most revered of all *hadith* collections, that of Bukhari: 'The Prophet was asked whether it was permissible to attack the pagan warriors at night with the probability of exposing their women and children to danger. The prophet replied, "They are from them".' (Volume 4, Book 52, *Hadith* 256) Two years later, on September 1, 2004, Sheikh Tantawi's ruling was obeyed to the letter, except for the target being in this instance Russian and not Israeli school children, when, at Beslan in south Russia, pro-Chechen Muslim terrorists took over 1,000 children, staff and parents hostage at the town's School Number One. Though security forces managed to free the majority of those being held hostage, after a siege of three days, of the 334 civilians who were killed, no fewer than 186 were children. But it is the Jews who are child killers.

'Baby killing' is not only sanctioned by Mohammed, Arab politicians and Muslim clerics. Those who do the killing are honoured and rewarded as heroes and role models. On March 11, 2011, five members of the Jewish Fogel family were murdered by a terrorist from a Palestinian family, the Awads. The five victims of this atrocity were a husband and wife, and their three children, aged eleven and four years, and two months. From the day of his arrest, the baby killer was paid a monthly salary by the Palestinian Authority, scheduled to rise over time to \$3,000 per month, four times that of a PA civil servant. On March 9, 1978, Dalal Mughrabi led a Fatah (and therefore Arafat-sanctioned) terrorist attack on a bus and other vehicles travelling along Israel's coastal road. All the passengers were civilians, of whom 38 were killed and another 71 wounded. Among the dead were thirteen children. In the ensuing shoot-out with the Israeli security forces, Mughrabi was killed. This, and the success of her mission, raised her to the level of a Palestinian

heroine. Three *schools* on the West bank are now named after a child-killer, along with summer camps for children, sports events, a town square and numerous other places and facilities. PA President Mahmoud Abbas, Israel's partner in the negotiations for a 'two state solution', even funded a computer centre named after her.

When it comes to Muslim on Muslim 'baby killing', like Black Lives Matter when blacks kill each other, double standards come into play. A Sunni suicide bomber blows him or herself up in a crowded market place or restaurant in a Shi'a quarter of Baghdad in the near certain knowledge that among the victims, there will be the children and even possibly babies of Muslim parents, yet there will be no outcry against child killers, either in the west or by clerics and politicians in the Middle East. Instead, those who sent them on their missions of fratricidal slaughter will hail them as heroes and martyrs. But when Palestinian civilians are murdered by Jewish racists and religious fanatics, as on the eve of the Gaza war of 2014, and again in August of 2015, their killers are not lionised by the Israeli public, rewarded by the government and honoured by having squares and schools named after them. They are publicly reviled and repudiated, even by their own families, arrested, tried, convicted, and punished as their crimes deserve.

The same standard is applied to members of the Israel Defence Force (IDF) when they are accused of committing war crimes. After the arrest in March 2016 of an Israeli soldier accused and then convicted of needlessly shooting dead a terrorist suspect who was already effectively a prisoner, Israel's Defence Minister Moshe La'alon reported to the Knesset that a preliminary investigation had established that 'this was a case of a soldier who has transgressed and was not a hero'. He challenged those Israelis who might think otherwise (and to be sure, they exist) by asking them, 'what do you want? A brutal army that has lost its moral backbone?' Yet atrocities incited and applauded by Palestinian clerics and politicians, and the manner in which those who commit them are honoured, escape condemnation by Israel's critics. Likewise, Hamas and Hezbollah and their supporters in the west have accused Israel of deliberately killing babies, yet both movements have as their aim not only the elimination of the state of Israel, but the extermination of the entire Jewish people, a goal that like Hitler's Final Solution, can only be accomplished by Jihadi Herods killing every Jew even down to the newest-born baby. But it is the Jews who are the baby killers. During and after the Hamas-Israel conflict of 2014, Israel was charged with not only deliberately killing children but of targeting schools and hospitals, even though the military (not to speak of the political) advantages these alleged actions afforded the Israeli Defence Force was never explained. There was, however, a very obvious military and political advantage to be gained by the Hamas tactic of situating tunnel entrances, rocket launching sites and other military installations in these very same buildings. (See Chapter 2)

An Al-Qaeda training manual recommends the following: 'In every country, we should hit their [the Jews'] organisations, institutions, clubs and hospitals...the targets must be identified, carefully chosen and include their largest gatherings so that any strike should cause thousands of deaths.' By any standards save those of the United Nations Council of Human Rights, not only perpetrating, but inciting and rewarding such barbarities as those related above surely constitute war crimes. By the same token, so must indoctrinating young children, some little older than toddlers, in a Jew-hatred so vicious that when they are but a few years older, they will be sufficiently malleable to be selected and trained to put it into practice. Yet

when attacked by its Jihadi enemies, and in the course of defending itself, its armed forces inadvertently causes civilian casualties, it is Israel that is accused by a range of UN agencies, each dancing to the same anti-Semitic tune of the Muslim and Arab lobbies, of committing war crimes, despite overwhelming proof that Hamas has itself deliberately pursued a policy that seeks to maximum its own civilian casualties and, what is more, has made no secret of it. Fathi Hammad, the Hamas Minister of the Interior, explained, on Hamas TV in 2008, the (illegal) tactic of the 'human shield', endorsed, also illegally, as we have seen, by Corbyn in the Cairo Declaration of December 18-19, 2002.

The enemies of God do not know that the Palestinian people have developed their methods of death and death seeking [sic]. For the Palestinian people, death has been an industry [sic], at which women excel, as do all the people living in this land. The elderly excels at this as do the Mujahidin and the children [sic]. This is why they have formed human shields of the women, the children, the elderly and the Mujahidin in order to challenge the Zionist bombing machine. It is as if they were saying to the Zionist enemy, "We desire death just as you desire life".

In the light of this statement, let us remind ourselves once again of Sharia leftist Deepa Kumar's fatuous claim, made in 2011, that 'Hamas today is a different organisation than the one founded in 1988'. Three years later, at the onset of Gaza conflict of 2014, on July 8, the Hamas spokesman Sami Ahu Auhri provided on the Hamas Al Aqsa TV channel a graphic description of the human shield tactic it would employ:

People are reverting to the human shield method which proved very successful in the days of the martyr Nizar Riyan [a Hamas pioneer of suicide bomb tactics]. This attests to the character of our noble [sic], *Jihad*-fighting people who defend their rights and their homes with their bare chests and their blood. The policy of confronting the Israeli warplanes with their bare chests in order to protect their homes has proven effective against the occupation...We in Hamas call upon our people to adopt this policy.

For certain without intending to, Auhri paid Israel the compliment of doing its best to avoid civilian casualties, for how else could the human shield 'policy' have 'proved effective'? If killing babies is standard IDF policy why did its soldiers not blaze away regardless? Given that Hamas made no secret of this strategy, even boasting about it publicly on its TV network, the world's media must surely have known, well before the Gaza war of 2014, that the 'human shield' tactic, defined and outlawed by the UN and the International Criminal Court as a war crime, was being exploited in order to manipulate world public opinion in its favour. And yet in the event, the media did just as Hamas wanted them to do, as it did during the PLO's rape of Lebanon, depicting Israeli Jews as 'baby killers', and Hamas as heroic resistance fighters. Neither was it just journalists who allowed themselves and, in some cases for sure, wanted to become vehicles for Hamas propaganda. In total defiance of the irrefutable evidence that Hamas sought to maximise the deaths of its own civilians by provoking military conflicts that provided the opportunity to do so, both the UN Human Rights Council and the International Court of Justice declared their intention to bring charges of war crimes committed during the Gaza conflict of 2014 against...Israel. Yet the same anti-Zionist zealots who routinely

accuse Israeli servicemen of deliberately killing children in the course of military operations (though why they should want to do this is never explained) make no secret of their support for the killing of civilians when the targets are Jews, as a Palestinian journalist, Khaled Abu Toameh, discovered, much to his disgust, during a lecture tour of US universities in 2009: 'Many of the people I met on the campuses [and these included professors as well as students] supported Hamas and believed that it was right to "resist the occupation" even if that meant blowing up women and children on a bus in downtown Jerusalem.' This, naturally, would not constitute a war crime, but an act of legitimate 'resistance' to an 'occupation' that was being enforced by women and children sitting in a bus.

Departing from its normal brief, which is to secure the release from captivity of 'Prisoners of Conscience' (of which the Islamic world abounds) even Amnesty International echoed the Hamas lie that Israel deliberately targets civilians, though again without being able to explain why. In a report issued shortly after the end of the war titled 'Families under the Rubble', it accused Israel, not Hamas, of 'callous indifference' towards civilian casualties. ('Indifference', however 'callous', is not 'targeting'.) It never took to task Hamas for ordering civilians into zones of combat to ensure that they would end up 'under the rubble', locating tunnels and rocket launchers in or next to schools, Mosques, hospitals and residential rather than unpopulated areas, or made the well-founded accusation that it was Hamas, not Israel, which had violated Article 51 of the Geneva Convention, which obliges all governments in time of war to protect as best they can their civilian populations. Israel did exactly this with its 'Iron Dome', and for doing so, was accused by a Jewish anti-Zionist commentator of 'entrench[ing] an already asymmetrical conflict into a state of ongoing bloodshed, dispossession and devastation the Palestinians of Gaza.' Hamas, which, like all Islamic states, does not recognise the man-made Geneva Convention, by deliberately exposing Gaza civilians, including children, to the risk of injury and death, did the exact opposite. But by the general agreement, if not collusion, of the various agencies that were supposed to objectively investigate such charges, it was Israel that found itself in the dock for protecting its citizens, Arabs no less than Jews, while Hamas, which was not only trying to kill them, but, avowedly, maximising its own civilian casualties, was allowed to pose as the innocent victim of Zionist war crimes.

To give Amnesty International its due however, in a second report on the Gaza conflict, issued in March 2015, it back-tracked more than somewhat from its first, accusing Hamas of committing war crimes, not only against Jewish civilians killed and wounded by the indiscriminate firing of rockets into Israeli territory, but against its own population. It confirmed in its report what I have said above, that rockets Hamas launched from heavily populated areas fell short of their Jewish targets, killing 11 Gaza children and two adults. The ratio of children killed to adults not only lent support to the Amnesty report's claim that Hamas failed to protect its own civilians, it was also consistent with the accusation that by choosing not to do so, it deliberately sought to use them as casualty fodder to be viewed by the world's media, a tactic that undoubtedly worked to perfection. For daring to expose the cynical tactics employed by Hamas in the Gaza war, Amnesty was denounced as a 'Zionist organisation', no doubt playing its allotted part in the world Jewish conspiracy that the Hamas Covenant claimed was first exposed in *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. In going some way to correcting the bias and omissions of its first, Amnesty's second report and for that it deserved at least qualified praise.

It cannot have been easy to arrive at the conclusions it did, knowing full well the hostile reactions they would provoke not only in the Middle East, but in all probability from much of the western left. Where the United Nations is concerned, however, no such 'balance' can be expected. Its track record tells us what to expect every time the Middle East question comes up for discussion. Consider for example the double standards the UN has adopted when it comes to racism. In 1975, its General Assembly, dominated by an alliance of Islamic states and third world and Soviet bloc dictatorships, defined and condemned Zionism as a racist doctrine, despite Israel's having outlawed political parties that promote racism. Yet Arab and Islamic TV networks with impunity have on a daily basis instilled anti-Semitism into their viewers, with the emphasis on programmes targeted specifically at children. Such programmes routinely invoke and even enact themes from the *Protocols*, citing in justification the *Koran's* description of the Jews as, quote, 'apes and swine'. Egyptian television has screened a lavishly funded *thirty-part* series based on the *Protocols* with a cast of no fewer than 400. Naturally, this production has been recycled on TV networks all around the Arab world, stoking up yet more hatred against the Jews.

Dominated as it always is by a united front of anti-Israel delegates, (See Appendices G and II) the UN Human Rights Council has never displayed any concern about state-sponsored anti-Semitism, not least because in the case of the Islamic states represented on the Council, it was their own media and schools that were responsible for promoting it. Instead, the Islamic bloc on the Council lobbied for a UN resolution that by curtailing freedom of speech, would protect from criticism the religion that is itself the main source of anti-Semitism in the world today. In October 2009, on the proposal of Egypt and, outrageously, with the support of the Obama administration, the Human Rights Council adopted a resolution calling for limitations on free speech in cases of 'any negative racial and religious stereotyping', and for the criminalisation of 'any advocacy of national or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence'. The reference to 'religious stereotyping', code for criticism of Islam, together with the religious identity of the sponsors of this resolution, readily betrayed its partisan character.

The point has already been made that Egyptian TV is one of the worst offenders when it comes to 'racial stereotyping', with its barrage of TV programmes featuring dramatisations of medieval Christian myths of Jewish ritual murder. Egypt is also responsible for both Arabic translations of *Mein Kampf*, and the dissemination of its companion volume, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, endorsed as genuine by Egypt's most illustrious son, President Gamal Abdel Nasser. Finally, there is Egypt's role as a safe haven for Nazis fleeing Allied war crimes charges at the end of the Second World War. All in all, hardly a track record that suggests Egypt's Human Rights Council delegation had Jews in mind when it moved its resolution condemning 'racial stereotyping'. Once deciphered, the purpose of the resolution was clear. It was to criminalise 'Islamophobia', not anti-Semitism. Equally to the point, why was Obama supporting a resolution that in advocating restrictions on free speech, was in conflict with his own country's First Amendment, which he was by law duty bound to uphold? (See Appendix B) True to form, the UN General Assembly followed suit by violating its own Universal Declaration of Human Rights, specifically Article 19 upholding freedom of expression, when in November 2010, it approved, by a large majority, a resolution outlawing what it

termed the 'vilification of religion', the religion in mind, given that the sponsor once again was the Muslim bloc of nations, being Islam.

For two decades and more, much has been said about the prevalence of 'Islamophobia', and the need to combat it, including by legal means, but little or nothing about what it actually is. This term is, with good reason, never properly defined, (See Chapter 28) with the result, and probably intentionally so, that it can be deployed as a blanket term to cover, criminalise and thus suppress almost any criticism of Islam. The actual word itself is proof of the lack of awareness by its users of the most elementary rules of logic and no less an ignorance of semantics. After the 9/11, 7/7, Manchester, Paris, Nice, Beslan, and the Bali, Madrid, Bombay and numerous other atrocities throughout the world, all committed by Muslims in the name of Islam, it is glaringly obvious that there is nothing 'phobic', that is, irrational, about a fear of Islam and its doctrine of *Jihad*. The escalating levels of security measures and technology at airports and public venues seem to confirm this, whatever politicians say to the contrary. If indeed it is 'Islamophobic' to deny that Islam is a 'religion of peace', then the author of the *Koran* is guilty as charged. Muslim clerics and western politicians both need to be asked this question: what other construction can be reasonably put on the following Koranic texts other than the duty to wage *Jihad* against the enemies of Islam, and at that by the most barbaric of methods? (Appendix L has a much larger selection)

...slay these transgressors wherever you meet them...'(Chapter 2, Verse 192)

Fight them until there is no more persecution [that is, only of Muslims], and religion is professed only for Allah. (Chapter 2, Verse 194)

...whoso fights in the cause of Allah, be he slain or victorious, We shall soon give him a great reward. (Chapter 4, Verse 75)

Fight, therefore in the way of Allah...and urge on the believers to fight. (Chapter 4, Verse 85)

Those of the believers who sit at home, excepting the disabled ones, and those who strive in the cause of Allah with their wealth and their persons are not equal. (Chapter 4, Verse 96. The kind of 'striving' [in Arabic, *Jihad*] indicated here must be military, since only the disabled are excused it.)

If you will not go forth to fight, in the cause of Allah, He will punish you with a painful punishment. (Chapter 9, Verse 39)

Those who are killed in the way of Allah, He will never render their works vain. (Chapter 47, Verse 5)

Although the USA, or the 'Great Satan' as the Ayatollahs have it, has suffered more than any other western nation as the target for Islamic terror, some of its academics have competed with each other in the quest to define *Jihad* in ways that not only render the term innocuous, but even invest the word with meanings that can be embraced and acted upon by non-Muslims. As is nearly always the case in such detoxification exercises, not one of those scholars who undertook the task was able to cite any Koranic source to validate their efforts to rebrand *Jihad* as a mission of peace, love and tolerance. Some of the results were laughable and, for academics, a disgrace to their calling. Zayid Yasin, a former President of the Harvard Islamic Society, defined *Jihad* 'in its purest form' (sic) as 'a struggle involving people of all ages, colours, and creeds [sic] for control of the Big Decisions, not only [nb] who controls what piece of land, but more importantly who gets medicine, who can eat.' Here there is still an admission, slipped in *en passant*, that *Jihad* might have

something to do with territorial disputes and ambitions, but the stress is on meanings that people of not only 'all ages and colours' but of all faiths and none can subscribe to. Defined in these terms, *Jihad* has been entirely divested of its original Koranic meaning as a 'struggle' or 'striving' to spread the rule of Islam to the whole world by all means necessary.

Harvard history Professor Roy Mottahedeh went a step further, claiming that 'a majority of [unnamed] learned Muslim thinkers, drawing on impeccable scholarship [likewise unnamed], insist that *Jihad* must be [sic] understood as a struggle without arms.' What kind of 'impeccable scholarship' is it that refuses to accept what the source materials unambiguously proclaim not once, but literally hundreds of times? Joseph Elder, Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, also believes that *Jihad* has nothing to do with violence of any kind. This was a 'gross misinterpretation'. *Jihad* was purely a 'religious struggle'. True enough, but a struggle to be waged, as the *Koran* repeats over and again, if necessary, by force of arms. (See Appendix L) Roxanne Euben of Wellesly College argued that 'for many Muslims, *Jihad* means to resist temptation and become a better person'. Yes, it might. But they are wrong, because nowhere is that definition to found either in the *Koran* or the most trusted collections of *Hadith*. Numerous surveys have proved that for many Muslims, 'being a better person' is to obey the repeated command in the *Koran* to wage war on behalf of Allah. (For the proof that they are right, I refer the reader again to Appendix L)

Other equally fatuous definitions include those of John Parcels, Professor of philosophy and religious studies at Georgia's Southern University, with *Jihad* as a struggle 'over the appetites and your own will' (taken literally, this definition simply does not make any sense, since it is the 'will' that does the struggling); that of Ned Rinalducci, Professor of sociology at Armstrong Atlantic University, with 'internally to be a good Muslim, and externally to create a just society', and surely taking the palm for audacious politically correct fantasy, that of Farid Esack, Professor of Islamic Studies at New Harvard Divinity School, with *Jihad* as 'resisting apartheid or working for women's rights'...for example obliging women to submit, as the *Koran* requires, to marital and concubine rape and wife beating, and the requirement of four adult male witness to substantiate a charge of rape.

Moving on from *Jihad*, we have another jewel in the crown of Islam, slavery. Guest speaker Jonathan Brown, Georgetown University Professor of Islamic Studies, explained to his audience at the Virginia International Institute of Islamic Thought that unlike how it was practised in the infidel world, slavery 'was not racialised under Islam', which in a sense was true, because Muslims enslaved white Europeans as well as black Africans. But did being racially 'inclusive' make Islamic slavery any the less iniquitous? Professor Brown obviously thought so, because he insisted that it was 'not immoral for a human to own another human', at least, when the owner was a Muslim, because 'slaves were protected by Sharia law'. Lucky slaves. Rape, again when practiced by Muslims, likewise for Professor Brown shed its horrors. 'Consent is not necessary for lawful sex'... lawful, that is, for Muslim husbands who rape their wives, and Muslim men, both single and married, who own and rape their *kuffar* concubines.

When confronted with citations from the universally accepted texts of Islam that refute the claims made by its apologists, the standard procedure is that they have been quoted 'out of context'. First of all, this begs the very obvious question: what 'context' can possibly explain away or justify the explicit command to crucify or

decapitate fellow human beings whose only 'crime' is not to agree with the tenets of a certain religion? The beating of wives and the rape of enslaved women? Or to incite hatred against Jews by calling them 'apes and swine'? Then there is another question: what exactly is this 'context' that can lend words meanings so vastly at variance with their universally accepted usage? What are the limits of this 'context'? (This is an issue I have already explored in Chapter 3.) Every context of a cited text is itself a text within a yet larger context, until the text and context become by stages the entire work cited. But then by the same token, this too needs to be placed in its context...other works of similar nature etc, the times, the place. One could go on expanding the 'context' *ad infinitum* until the cited text under review is made to shrink to total insignificance, which is indeed the purpose of the exercise. 'Crucify' and 'beat', to take two of many such examples, are after all just a couple of words in a work of many thousands. This frequently employed tactic, whereby awkward passages are made to shrink to the point of vanishing, might be justly termed the Sharia Invisible Text Trick. But just when context is essential to understand the proper meaning of a passage, in order to present a picture of Islam totally at variance with its holiest texts, this same passage is, often without acknowledgment, wrenched from its full and proper context and even mutilated so as to convey an opposite meaning to the one intended. We have seen one example of this tactic used by Obama.

But the classic case is a (doctored) excerpt from the *Koran* frequently invoked after a Jihadi atrocity. It was repeatedly cited after 9/11 and recycled more recently by what was falsely presented as a reading from the *Koran* by Deputy Prime Minister Clegg before the world's media outside No 10 Downing Street, after the murder and attempted decapitation of Fusillier Lee Rigby in May 2013 by two recent converts to Islam. It was also quoted, in the wake of the Orlando gay club massacre, and again in its redacted version, by the same theologian who in his address at the Hussein Islamic Centre in Orlando shortly before the killings, endorsed Sharia law's death penalty for homosexuals. The passage as (mis) quoted by Clegg is from Chapter 5, Verse 34: 'Whoever kill[s] a human being shall be looked upon as though he had killed all mankind; and that whoever save[s] a human life shall be regarded as though he had saved all mankind.' Anyone listening to Clegg's fraudulent citation and not familiar with the verse in question - and that would be the vast majority of the UK (and world's) population, including most of its Muslims - could reasonably infer from what they heard that despite all appearances to the contrary, Islam was in its true nature a religion of peace, and that its founder-warrior was of all things a pacifist, totally opposed to the taking of even a single human life. And that was indeed Clegg's intention. Yet by placing the Clegg citation in its true 'context', that is, citing the verse in its entirety, and then relating it to the one that follows, we are given the diametric opposite message to the one Clegg intended. The missing words of Verse 34, and the verse that follows, are italicised:

That was why We laid it down for the Israelites that whoever killed a human being, except as punishment for murder or other villainy in the land, shall be looked upon as though he had killed all mankind; and that whoever saved a human life shall be regarded as though he had saved all mankind. Our apostles brought them veritable proofs; yet it was not long before many of them [i.e., the Jews] committed great evils in the land. Those that make war against God and His apostle and spread disorder

shall be put to death or crucified or have their hands and feet cut off on opposite sides or be banished from the country.

The meaning of these two verses is palpably clear. And so it surely must have been to Clegg, or at the very least, to whoever presumably brought it to his attention. The 'context' is evident from the 'text' itself. The Jews (the 'Israelites') had been disobeying Allah, and were to be punished accordingly, in ways that do not sit easily with the image of Islam that Clegg was promoting, any more than did his claim that the atrocious murder of Fusillier Rigby 'flies in the face of the peace and love that Islam teaches'. Peace and love? Let us read again the continuation in Verse 35 which Clegg wisely if duplicitously chose not to read out: 'Those that make war against God and His apostle [that is, Mohammed] and spread disorder shall be put to death or crucified or have their hands and feet cut off on opposite sides or be banished from the country.' In Parliament, with the same end in mind, Prime Minister Cameron fatuously described the murder of Rigby as 'a crime against Islam', a statement which, to anyone not familiar with the facts, could suggest that Lee Rigby had been murdered *because* he was a Muslim, when the evidence and the most elementary common sense tell us that on the contrary, Rigby had been killed by two Muslims because, as an infidel soldier, he was seen as an *enemy* of Islam. It was a crime committed by dedicated Muslims converts explicitly in the name of Islam, and for which they were not only prepared to but wanted to die. At the scene of the murder, one of the killers begged to be shot by police marksmen, thus rendering him a martyr and therefore entitling him to enjoy the well-known sensual rewards that the Islamic paradise provides in such cases. As if to clinch matters regarding their motive for killing Rigby, at the scene, a leaflet was handed out by his two assassins citing no less than 55 citations from the *Koran*.

At the ensuing trial, the *Koran* was again cited by the defence for the same purpose, 22 verses in all. When this was pointed out in the House of Lords by former UKIP leader Lord Pearson of Rannoch as an example of why Muslims should 'address the violence' that was to be found in the *Koran*, two outraged Labour MPs (both of course Muslims) were stung into action. Khalid Mahmoud made a formal complaint to the Speaker of the House of Lords, though on what grounds was not clear, because unlike outside the walls of Parliament, rules governing privilege mean that within both Houses, speech is free, even when it is on touchy subjects like Islam. As bad luck, or this case, *Kismet*, would have it, it was not Lord Pearson but Mahmoud who had fallen foul of Parliamentary regulations, after he was caught using undeclared taxpayers' money to pay a bill of £1,350 as the cost of nine (possibly adulterous) nights in a five-star Kensington hotel with his girlfriend.

The other MP, Yamin Quershi, only succeeded in revealing her extraordinary ignorance of Islam's most sacred text: 'These are lies. Trying to say [he did say] that this comes from some text [sic] in the *Koran*'. But it did! And as for 'some text'...this was rich. If it can be dismissed as only 'some text', why the outrage? Yet it was not. We have here the sacred word of Allah, which in the passages cited at the trial, as the court record will show, did indeed proclaim the duty of performing *Jihad* against infidels. The trial judge had no problem with the citing of (motivational) Islamic texts, so why the implication that it had been a breach of Parliamentary rules to do so in the House of Lords?

A similar scenario was played out in November 2015, only on this occasion it was a Tory government spokesman who undertook to assert the peaceful nature of

a traduced Islam. An undeterred Lord Pearson had proposed that the Government should sponsor the formation of a 'council of Muslim leaders' to 'clarify the modern meaning of their religion and cast the extremists out of Islam.' An eminently sensible proposal, one would have thought, and one that would have had the assent of a number of reformist Muslims, some of who I cite in this work. However, Lord Lamont, speaking for the government, was having none of it: 'It would be totally inappropriate for the state to be involved, as Lord Pearson has suggested, in a critique of one of the world's great [sic] religions.' But Lord Pearson had not proposed that it should be, only that it could, if it so wished, initiate the formation of a Muslim council for the purposes he proposed, neither of which required 'the state' to engage in a 'critique' of anything or, for that matter, endorse the conclusions, if indeed any were arrived at, by a such a council. In rejecting Lord Pearson's proposal, Lord Lamont however quite correctly made the observation that it was not the government's place to 'interfere with theological questions', a barb better directed against his own Prime Minister, and his former deputy Prime Minister, who after each atrocity carried out by Muslims, had made it a regular practise to reassure the world that such acts are not sanctioned by what they invariably described as the or a Religion of Peace. What are such comments if not 'interfering in theological questions'? And if it is permitted for government leaders to praise a religion as being one that 'teaches peace and love', and to attempt to prove it by a crudely doctored quotation from the *Koran*, as Nick Clegg did on the steps of Number 10 Downing Street after the murder and attempted decapitation of Fusillier Lee Rigby by two Muslims, why is it not also permissible to refer to and comment on certain passages from the *Koran* that are not falsified?

After Lamont's rejection of Lord Pearson's proposal, a queue formed of Muslim Peers eager to uphold the good name of their religion. It quickly become evident that as is almost invariably the case in such exchanges, the infidel was far better informed as to the contents of the *Koran* than those believers who hastened to defend it. First up was Lord Ahmad for the Government, who had no compunction concerning his readiness to defy Lord Lamont's injunction against state interference in matters theological. He offered as proof of the peaceful and loving nature of Islam 'that with the exception of one verse in the holy *Koran* every verse starts with the words "in the name of the God, the most gracious, the most merciful", which underlines the true sentiments and principle of that religion.' When did Lord Ahmad last read his holy *Koran*? The words he quoted preface not each verse bar one, but each *chapter* bar one...an elementary error worthy of an ignorant *kuffar*. If the words prefaced each *verse* but one, they would be repeated no less than approximately 6,200 times, since this is the number of verses in the *Koran*, whereas the number of Chapters, or *Suras*, in the *Koran* is 114. The number of words in the *Koran* is approximately 78,000. So if Lord Ahmed had been correct in saying that the 12-word passage where Allah is singing his own praises is repeated 6,200 times, then this would have added up to 67,400 words, leaving less than 11,000 words for the *Koran's* main text. We can easily appreciate why, in this lamentably ill-informed exercise in selective quoting, he wished to draw attention away from what lies between the repeated passage that he cites, because therein will be found 'the true sentiments and principle' of Ahmad's faith. Next Muslim in the queue was Liberal Democrat Baroness Hussein-Ecke, who deployed the standard diversionary tactic of questioning whether it was 'helpful or constructive' that a religious text should be 'taken and quoted selectively [like Nick Clegg and Lord Ahmad for example] in

a negative, [how can one quote 'negatively?'] political [ditto] and divisive [ditto] way to put whole communities on trial'. None of which had of course been proposed by Lord Pearson, as well the Baroness knew. Would quoting from and criticising certain passages in the Bible put the UK's Christians or Jews 'on trial'? And if so, for what crime? Finally, we had Tory Baroness Mobarik, who though she wisely, unlike Lord Ahmad, admitted lacking any 'expertise' in 'Islamic theology', nevertheless considered herself sufficiently well-versed in such matters to assert that 'the nature of Islam' was concerned with 'peace, compassion and obeying the law of the land'. Leaving aside those considerable numbers of UK Muslims who supported the Islamic State and, in even larger numbers, more generally, Jihadism, it would have been interesting to know what Baroness Mobarik thought about the clear majority of her co-religionists in the UK (as elsewhere in the Muslim diaspora) who, as a number of surveys have established, wish to be ruled, not by 'the law of the land' but the law of Allah.

These examples show to what ill-informed and, as in the case of Clegg's Koranic redaction, duplicitous lengths politicians, non-Muslims no less than Muslims, are prepared to go to protect Islam from public criticism or even debate. In addition to the introduction and draconian enforcement by successive governments of so-called hate speech laws, there have been cases when the Home Office has used immigration regulations to deny entry into the UK to those seeking to promote views about Islam that do not accord with its quasi-official government status as a religion of peace. In 2008, the Dutch anti-Islam MP, Geert Wilders, produced a 17-minute film, *Fitna*, consisting almost entirely of quotations from the *Koran* that advocate acts of violence against unbelievers, and of images of atrocities carried out by Muslims in the name of their religion. The film was banned by Dutch TV, and when made available on the Liveleaks website, was removed the next day after the site received threats 'of a very serious nature'. Islamic terror works. (See Appendix P)

The saga of Sharia censorship continued when, in February 2009, after Wilders was invited by Lord Pearson to show his film to an audience at Westminster, Labour Home Secretary Jacqui Smith intervened by denying Wilders' entry into the UK, a ban which was then overturned after he lodged an appeal with the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal. (It was also during Smith's tenure at the Home Office that a letter to all police authorities in England and Wales was sent instructing them not to take any action against Muslim trafficking, pimping and raping of under age, mainly white working-class girls who, it was alleged, 'had made an informed choice about their sexual behavior'. Being gang raped 'an informed choice'? For the full sordid story, see Appendix E.)

Wilders, an elected MP with no criminal record, whose only concern was to raise the alarm about Islam's threat to western liberal democratic values, was seen and treated as an undesirable alien, while Muslim clerics arriving in the UK, including those who preach the message of violence and hatred that *Fitna* had exposed, had experienced no such difficulties, passing through immigration like any run of the mill tourist to speak at Westminster as a guest of Sharia left Labour MP and from September 2015, Labour Leader, Jeremy Corbyn.

However, as initially with Wilders, there was a different outcome when in June 2013, a US academic, Robert Spencer, the author of a considerable number of books on Islam, and a former adviser to top level US military, intelligence and security agencies, sought and was then denied admission to the UK, on the grounds that he

had allegedly stated that 'Islam is a religion and is a belief system that mandates warfare against unbelievers for the purposes for [sic] establishing a societal model that is incompatible with Western society'. No reference was given for this alleged (and illiterate) quotation, for the simple reason, as Spencer made clear, that no such passage could be found in any of his writings or speeches. It had been fabricated, outrageously, in order to generate a spurious case for his exclusion from the UK. Nevertheless, it captures, if somewhat crudely and in bad English, the gist of one aspect of Spencer's researches into Islam. Within days of Spencer's being excluded as an undesirable alien who told the truth about Islamic *Jihad*, there arrived in the UK a very welcome Muslim guest, the Saudi Sheikh Muhammed al-Arefe, who had also placed on record his views about the same subject, opinions which bore an uncanny resemblance to those attributed to Spencer and which, in his case, were cited as the reason for his exclusion: 'Devotion to *Jihad* for the sake of Allah, and the desire to shed blood, to smash skulls, [sic!] and to sever limbs [sic!] for the sake of Allah and in defence of His religion, is, undoubtedly, an honour for the believer.' An honour to *smash skulls*? As this was not a reincarnated Prohibition-era baseball bat wielding Mafiosi talking, but a devote of the Religion of Peace, his holiness was duly waved through. Obviously, another *ad hominem* case of not what is said, but who says it.

10 Reformation?

At this point, a necessary digression (admittedly one of several) is called for. It concerns the problems that confront reforming Muslim scholars when they attempt to reconcile what are universally held to be perfect and therefore unchangeable sacred texts, as for example those concerning the punishment for apostasy, or concerning the natural world, with the methods and findings of science and, more broadly, the rational and humanistic norms of western civilisation. In the modern world, it is nigh on universally accepted as a matter of course that propositions and hypotheses dealing with secular matters, be they for example about science, philosophy, economics or politics, are subject to scrutiny by experts and tested in the light of evidence. Certainly, in the worlds of serious academic disciplines, and for an increasing number of people beyond them, the claims made by religions are not exempted from these procedures. Consequently, the authority exerted by Genesis in a western laboratory or observatory is zero. The problem confronting those brave few (and they are, sadly, very few) who seek, for want of a better word, to 'modernise' Islam is that while in the west, science, along with a range of other disciplines, after centuries of struggle, has liberated itself from the dogmas of theology, the Muslim mind remains firmly in their grip, held there in a number of Islamic states by sheer terror, as those of Christianity were in the minds of its believers by the Inquisition in times now long past. But it seems that for most of the world's Muslims - it is impossible to say how many - just as it did more than a thousand or more years ago, the *Koran* still trumps all. And that submission to its writ exacts a terrible toll.

The western world, for all its vicissitudes and failings, has prospered because it has learned, in the course of emancipating itself from religious dogma, not merely to permit but to value dissent, debate and polemic in all things of interest to the human mind. As a result, today, although great passions may be aroused over the validity or otherwise of a scientific hypothesis, a moral axiom or a political programme, it is generally agreed by the disputants that the criterion of proof is always the examination of evidence in accordance with the rules of logical reasoning.

When scientists disagree, as they frequently do, they do not maim, crucify, behead, burn and bury alive or torture each other, ban or burn each other's books, and wage wars against advocates of rival hypotheses as their ancestors once did over the meaning of a religious text, because their prime concern is to deepen mankind's understanding of the nature and workings of the universe, from the infinitely small to the infinitely large, not to silence those with whom they differ. In the world of culture, analogous principles apply. Doubtless at times accentuated by subjective factors, there have always been, and will continue to be, rivalries and disputes between contrasting and contending schools and styles of literature, music and the plastic and visual arts. At times, they can become heated, even vicious and petty. But again, there is no instance of composers (Mozart's poisoning by a jealous Salieri is pure fiction), novelists, playwrights, poets, painters or sculptors settling their differences by seeking the suppression or destruction of another's work, let alone by resorting to violence or murder.

Perhaps one of the most instructive examples of passionately contested controversy that can be aroused in the world of culture was the feud that erupted in Germany (where else) over the direction and form musical composition should take after the death of Beethoven in 1827. Two schools confronted each other like hostile armies, the traditionalists, initially led by Brahms and Schumann, and the 'New German School', represented by Wagner and his father-in-law to be, Liszt. Just like a party-political contest (and in a sense, it was) manifestos were unleashed on the German musical public, setting out the cases of the contesting forces. Critics quickly joined the fray. But because of the capital importance of music to German life, and the stature of the leading participants, the clash of these musical titans spilled over into the public arena. Not only the musical press, but the main German dailies and reviews carried lengthy features on the progress of the contest, as critics took one side or the other, filling up entire pages of newspapers more accustomed to reporting on matters political, diplomatic and economic.

This was indeed a war of a kind, over the future of not only German but, because of its uncontested supremacy, all western concert music. The stakes could not have been higher. Yet the only blows landed were those of textual and verbal exchanges and musical sounds. Similar and no less vituperative battles have been waged between rival schools in the visual and plastic arts, but again, the only casualties were bruised egos. It is not that such disputes and rivalries are of little consequence in the great scheme of things. As Beethoven, a child of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution understood so well, 'only art and science can raise men to the level of the gods', enriching the human condition as nothing else can, and which prosper best when and where thought and its expression are free. Creative minds understood better than any others that violence cannot transform a third-rate poem, painting or symphony into a masterpiece, or prove that the sun revolves around the earth, though even the mere thought of clerical torture made the greatest of astronomers say it did. But we have no right to expect or demand that geniuses should, like Giordano Bruno, condemned for heresy by the Roman Inquisition, and then tortured and burned at the stake in 1600 for his refusal, on pain of death, to forswear his belief that the universe was infinite, also have to be heroes and martyrs. Roberto Bellarmino, the Cardinal who oversaw the trial and condemnation of Bruno was elevated to sainthood in 1930, while his victim still awaits rehabilitation because, according to the Vatican, his ideas were and remain today 'incompatible with Christian thought'. Galileo has been more fortunate. 336 years after his condemnation and house imprisonment as a heretic, in 1992, the Vatican, putting in question its teaching that 'the Church never errs', admitted that Galileo had been right all along when he said the earth revolved around the sun, and not the reverse. Better late than never.

The lesson from the history of such dark times is that we should protect from the threats and violence of the intolerant, as the German communist Rosa Luxemburg so wisely said, especially 'those who think differently'. Force, whatever form it might take, proves nothing and refutes nothing. Although its use has been and still is necessary in defence of freedom, as a means of arriving at the truth or creating beauty, its value is zero. And as in the arts, so it is in science. Disputes among scientists are resolved, not by the racking, crushing and burning of human bodies, or the invocation of an infallible authority and an enforced conformity to its claims, but by the re-checking of data, the replication of experiments, by peer group review, the free exchange of information and the

publication in scientific journals of the results of the latest research. There is, and cannot be, any higher courts of appeal than these. There are no privileged propositions that, before the debate even begins, should held by all concerned to be perfect in every respect, and therefore exempt from critical scrutiny. But that is how religious fundamentalists, be they Jews, Christians or Muslims, treat their holy texts.

Another great battle of minds erupted seven decades after the Brahms-Wagner contest, and again, as indeed it had been with the Reformation, it was largely a Teutonic affair, only this time between scientists. Einstein, who only a few years previously had revised or overturned long accepted axioms of Newtonian physics, now found himself cast in the unaccustomed role, like Brahms and Schumann, of a custodian of orthodoxy, as aspects of his theory of relativity came under attack from the 'new physics' of Werner Heisenberg and Niels Bohr's quantum mechanics. When it became clear that their theory of indeterminacy challenged Einstein's belief in unvarying physical laws, it elicited from him the famous riposte that 'God does not play dice with the universe'. Here too, battle lines were drawn, factions formed, reputations bruised, and the academic mixed unavoidably with the personal, since not only the truth but great reputations were at stake.

In these two controversies, the terms of reference and criteria for judging the relative merits of the contending theses were purely secular even though they touched upon matters philosophical. It had not always been so. For as long as the Church served as the main, in some cases the only patron of what we might call serious music, just as it did in astronomy, it was able to impose its own ideas as to not only its subject matter, but rules as to how such music should be created and performed. For example, the Vatican even went so far as to ban for a time the use of the interval of a tritone, or augmented fourth, the so called 'devil's note', and even polyphony. Only with the Reformation and the rise of secular patronage was the Papacy's grip on music (as well as the visual and plastic arts) broken. The composition of sacred music of course continued as a genre, as it does to this day, but no self-respecting composer would any longer accept directions from clergymen as how it should be done. Beginning at the same time, science in Europe travelled a similar path of emancipation from theocratic tutelage to intellectual freedom, only with the important difference that, unlike music, its methods and discoveries collided explicitly with biblical teachings and texts. That is why no musician, however wayward, was brought before the Inquisition, but at least two scientists, Galileo and Bruno were, and Copernicus and Kepler, would have been had they not lived beyond its reach and wisely chosen to publish their heretical findings posthumously.

Although there is still a dwindling number of devout composers and artists whose main source of inspiration and subject matter is religious, what they create is today judged purely on the basis of its intrinsic merit, which is how it should be. Similarly, no scientist worthy of the name pursues their calling today as some once did, in order to validate the two (contradictory) Biblical accounts of the origins of the universe and life provided in Genesis. The same principle applies in other secular disciplines. What Christian historian, however pious, would in the twenty first century feel themselves obliged by their faith to conduct their researches in accordance with this pronouncement of a nineteenth-century cleric: 'Revealed religion furnishes facts to other [sic!] sciences which the sciences, left to themselves, would never reach. Thus, in the science of history, the preservation of

Noah's Ark is an historical fact, which history would never arrive at without revelation.' If any historian did today, they would become overnight a laughing stock in their entire academic community.

But despite talk of reform, that is exactly how matters still stand with Islam. All thought is trapped in the vice-like grip of a Koranic text that admits and permits of no revision or doubt, let alone outright denial. The Islamic mind is still today where the Christian mind was before the Reformation, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the invention of printing, the telescope and the microscope. Such science that there is, all it of dependent on and originating in the west, operates only in those spheres, such as technology and mathematics, that do not question Koranic teachings. The limits of what Muslims are permitted to think were defined by the most revered of all Islamic scholars, Imam Mohammad-al-Ghazzali, (1058-1111), the first to be awarded the title of *Hojat al Islam*, 'Proofs of Islam': 'The task of the Muslim scholar is to seek knowledge that reaffirms the message of the *Koran* and the teachings of the prophet. Philosophy, however, seeks casting doubt on all certainties by questioning them as its principal task.' Thomas a Kempis (1380-1471) not only enjoyed a similar status to al-Ghazzali amongst Roman Catholic theologians, he also shared his concern that the human mind should not overstep the boundaries delimited by scripture. His most famous work, *The Imitation of Christ*, in the aptly titled chapter *Of the Vanity of Human Learning*, has a fictionalised Jesus warning against the temptations of secular knowledge:

...read my word, not for the reputation of critical skill, and controversial wisdom, but to learn how to mortify thy evil passions; a knowledge of infinitely more importance than the solution of all the abstruse questions that have perplexed men's minds and divided their opinions...the hidden things of darkness shall be brought to light, and the clamorous tongue of reasoning and disputing man shall be as silent as the grave...I teach not, like men, with the clamour of uncertain words, or the confusion of opposite opinions, with vain learning.

Even Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) the most sophisticated theologian of his time, conceded that in matters concerning religious belief, reason and evidence had to give way to

the agency of the will, which chooses to assent to one side, definitely and positively, through some influence which is sufficient to move the will but not the intellect, namely, the fact that it seems good or fitting to assent to this side; this is the state of belief, as when a man believes in the words of someone because to believe seems becoming or advantageous; and thus we are moved to believe in certain sayings inasmuch as eternal life is promised to us as a reward for belief, and by this reward our will is moved to assent to what is said, although our understanding is not so moved by any evidence presented to it.

The Jesuits, or Society of Jesus, founded in 1534 to combat heresy within and without the Roman Church, took this principle a step further, by demanding of its members that in all things they totally surrender their critical faculties, to the extent that if the Church 'defined anything to be black, which to our eyes appears to be white, we ought in a like manner to pronounce it to be black.' Just as in the land of Big Brother, if the church says so, two plus two equals five. This strictly functional notion of what constitutes the truth (so-called 'alterative facts') was not a monopoly

of the Jesuits. After Galileo invited Urban VII to look through a telescope, the pope who was later to send him before the Inquisition and demand that he be tortured if he failed to abjure his heliocentrism, conceded 'that you may have irrefutable proof of the earth's motion.' But, he added, 'this does not mean that the earth moves.' First you see it...

Luther, for whom the literal word of the Bible was the sole fount not only of Christian faith, but of all worthwhile knowledge, was no less hostile to secular learning:

For reason is the greatest enemy that faith has: it never comes to the aid of spiritual things but, more frequently than not, struggles against the Divine Word, treating with contempt all that emanates from God...There is on earth among all dangers, no more dangerous thing than a richly endowed and adroit reason...Reason must be deluded, blinded, and destroyed.

Here the Protestant Reformationists and the papacy stood on common ground, threatened as they both were by the emergence of rational inquiry into matters that had hitherto been the strict preserve of faith. Even today, perhaps with the original sin of Adam in mind, we hear the same clerical warnings against the unfettered exercise of reason: 'The spirit of curiosity is not a good spirit. It is the spirit of dispersion, of distancing oneself from God, the spirit of talking too much [sic]. Jesus tells us something interesting: this spirit of curiosity, which is worldly, leads us to confusion.' This could be the rantings of a Bible-belt creationist preacher declaiming against the sins of a disbelieving world. In fact, these are the words of the currently reigning [2023] Islamophile Pope Francis II, who was heralded at his election by believer and non-believer alike as the long-awaited reformer of a church said to be 'out of touch' with contemporary life.

Islam however is not 'out of touch' with the modern world. It is at war with it, both in thought and, as we know to our cost, also in deed. In addition to its suppression of scientific inquiry and often ludicrous denial of proven facts, Islamic thought control, far more than its Christian equivalent did even when at its most repressive, continues to stultify high culture and even to ban altogether some of its forms. In the plastic and pictorial arts, the depiction of nature is totally forbidden by all schools of Islamic law. Some even forbid fictional writing (as a form of lying) and music. Under the (anti-imperialist) terror of the Taliban, musical instruments are forbidden and destroyed, while those who make or listen to music risk death. Even those schools of Islamic law that do permit music impose on it absurd conditions far more restrictive than those of the Roman Catholic Church at the height of its powers. We know from the tragic experience of cultural and intellectual life under Nazi and Stalinist totalitarianism how the regimentation of thought inhibits even the most abstract of mental pursuits. And so is the case with Islam. If its claims to superiority in all spheres of human endeavour have any validity, then the land of its birth, where it assumes its purist form, unsullied by any contact with any other faith or alien idea, should be leading all the world, not just in Islamic theology, but in the sciences, the arts, philosophy, technology, jurisprudence...yet the tally of Saudi Nobel prizes is zero. Muslims comprise approximately a quarter of the world's population, yet as of 2022, only three of a total of 412 Nobel Prizes for physics and chemistry have been awarded to Muslims, an Egyptian, a Pakistani, and a Turk...0.73 per cent. This is abysmal.

Just like inquisitive late medieval Christians, Muslims who might want to risk thinking for themselves are still today confronted with self-validating sacred texts which, by claiming a divine origin, place themselves beyond criticism. Unlike Christianity, which save for its most fundamentalist versions, has largely abandoned literalist readings of the Bible, especially when they at variance with contemporary knowledge of reality, Muslims almost universally continue to defer to the same literal infallibility for the *Koran* that Christians were beginning to question in the Bible three or more centuries ago. Just as Muslim astronomers (if such exist), are compelled to believe that the *Koran* is, at it says of itself, 'a perfect book' (2: 3), so they will necessarily also have to accept as true its assertion that the sun 'is moving towards its determined goal' (36: 39) 'float[ing] smoothly in an orbit' (36:41) around an earth that is flat, 'like a carpet spread out'. (20:53) How is a Muslim who believes every word of the *Koran* to be true, and hopes to pursue a career as a scientist, in this case as an astronomer, to reconcile this description of what is undeniably a geocentric universe, with Allah's claim that 'He has full knowledge of all things'? (57:4) Or an aspiring geologist, who reads in his holy book, 'have we not made the earth as a bed and the mountains as pegs?' (78: 7-8) To counter accusations that they have been in any way tempted by the claims of profane *kuffar* science to deviate by one iota from Koranic inerrancy, the editors of this translation boldly assert that these and other similar passages are demonstrations that the *Koran* 'anticipates new discoveries in the domain of science and philosophy'. Surely it is not due to the Islamophobia of judges, but the abysmal intellectual poverty of Islamic culture that to date, there has been not a single Nobel Prize-winning Muslim geologist or astronomer. Muslim biologists (again, if such exist) are likewise confronted with the mutually contradictory descriptions of a god that 'created man of dry ringed clay, of black mud wrought into shape' (*Koran*, 15: 27), 'from a clot of blood' (96:3), 'from water' (25:55) and 'from dust' (50:21). Echoing Hamlet, truly it can be said to those who believe in the infinite wisdom of Allah that 'there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in your philosophy.'

Those non-Muslims who look towards a time when, hopefully soon, Islam will undergo the same evolution (no *double entendre* intended) as mainstream Christianity, could well be making the mistake of seeing Islam as just another religion that, given time (and discreet encouragement) will prove itself to be no less amenable to reason and modernity as any other. The truth is that the furthest Islamic scholars are prepared to, or rather dare to go, is to offer alternative 'readings' or 'contextualisations' that, it is hoped, will present Islam in a more modern light than hitherto. It is a safe assumption that, given the rigour of Islamic belief, and the fate that awaits those who question it, the texts themselves will not be questioned or challenged in any way whatsoever, which is most certainly not the case with most modern Christian Bible scholarship, which, for example, now accepts that several of Paul's Epistles are spurious, and that Mark, believed to be the oldest of the four Biblical Gospels (there are about twenty in all) was composed at least four decades after the events it claims to describe.

The refusal, or perhaps rather total inability of Islamic scholars to treat in a similar critical way the texts of their faith, was demonstrated in August 2015, when Birmingham University announced it had discovered in its library fragments of text closely resembling the *Koran* that had been carbon dated to a time prior to the birth of its supposed recipient. Naturally this news aroused considerable interest among

academics specialising in the field of Islamic studies. One, Tom Holland, believed that the discovery 'to put it mildly, destabilises the idea that we can know anything with certainty about how the Koran emerged', while another, Keith Small of Oxford University's Bodleian Library, went further, proposing that the dating of the text gave credence to claims that Mohammed and his early followers had 'used a text that was already in existence and shaped it to fit their own political and theological agenda rather than Mohammed receiving a revelation from heaven.' Despite the scientifically-based evidence, Muslim scholars would have none of it. One, Senior Lecturer Mustafa Shah of the London School of Oriental Studies, even claimed that despite the text's predating by several decades the time when Mohammed is supposed to have received and had recorded by scribes his message from Allah, its discovery 'if anything consolidated traditional accounts of the *Koran's* origin.' Really? His students will no doubt be intrigued to learn that when necessary, the flow of time and causation that conventional infidel science tells us runs in one direction only, can be reversed if Allah so wills it. In the normal course of things, an academic who so spectacularly allows his or her private beliefs to subvert their professional integrity would be subjected to an inquiry and possible dismissal. But with the political climate being what it was, Mustafa Shah could rest assured that his career would survive the utterance of such idiocies. And it has

Those who call or hope for an 'Islamic Reformation' should also bear in mind that although the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century certainly shattered for ever the universalist claims of the Roman church in central and western Europe, and subsequently the rest of the world, those who unleashed this movement, Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, did so in the first place by denouncing the Papacy for its deviation from the letter of the sacred texts. In no sense was it motivated by the desire to adjust the teachings of Christianity to the spirit, learning and scientific discoveries of the new age then emerging. The problem with Islam is that it has its Luthers and Calvins in abundance, clerics whose minds cannot, dare not and therefore will not escape from the prison of a seventh century text, and begin to engage with reality as it is, and not as that text says it is.

What needs to be called for today, and happen, as an essential part of an already existing more general movement amongst some Muslims to as it were 'domesticate' the wilder strands of Islam, is a development in exactly the opposite direction, away from textual inerrancy, a process that in Christianity began in the latter decades of the 19th century, when German Protestant theologians, influenced by the increasing dominance of scientific, rational thinking in other spheres, and not being subject to the mental and professional disciplines of the Vatican, took the radical step of treating the Bible as a work created by fallible and morally flawed men, far removed in time and often place from the events they relate. When Catholic theologians attempted to adopt a similar approach, their knuckles were administered a sharp rapping from a Pope, Pius IX who had in 1870, declared himself to be infallible in matters of faith and morals, and that 'all those books which the church regards as sacred and canonical were written with all their parts under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit'

The presumption of a similarity between Islam and Christianity, upon which hopes of an Islamic Reformation in part depend, is in several respects a mistaken one. While both Islam and Christianity have undergone deep and violent schisms, the nature, manner and timing of their doing so fundamentally differed. The rifts that are raging in Islam today emerged upon the death of its founder and were, at

least in their origin, not doctrinal, but naked power struggles, usually resolved, as they still are today, by murder and warfare, between competing factions of the prophet's relatives and companions. While initial disputes in early Christianity were certainly influenced by geo-political factors, they were never tribal, clan or family based, and the theological differences were real enough, revolving around such issues as free will and pre-destination, definitions of the Trinity and the related problem of the nature and status of Jesus. With some arm-twisting by the newly converted secular power, the 'mystery' of the Trinity was resolved, at least to the satisfaction of Rome, in 325 by the Nicene doctrine. The process of enforcing at least a formal religious orthodoxy on the Empire was consummated in 381 at the Council of Constantinople, which banned all other faiths than that of Nicaean Christianity and, for the first time, authorised the execution of heretics and the destruction of Jewish and pagan places of worship. The poacher had turned gamekeeper. But despite their persecution, localised heresies periodically continued to flare up and thrive. On the macro level, there came in 1054 the 'Great Schism', again part geo-political and part theological, and again concerning the Trinity, between a Western Catholic Rome and what became the 'Eastern', predominately Slavonic 'Orthodox' Christianity of Byzantium. Like many of its successors, this purely territorial religious pluralism was one born of *real politick*, since Rome, now largely denuded of its temporal power, lacked the means to enforce its doctrinal will on a still surviving, though fast declining Eastern Empire.

Another five hundred years had to pass before the second great schism erupted within Christianity, that between a mainly Latin and southern Roman Catholicism, and a Teutonic and northern Protestantism, and yet again, like its predecessor, it was part theological, part geo-political. However, unlike the first, where Rome and Byzantium, after satisfying their honours by excommunicating each other, quietly went their separate ways, the second was fought out not only with sermons and the newly printed word, but on the battlefield, not between east and west, but between north and south, in a series of savage wars, religious, dynastic, civil and national, that devastated and depopulated entire tracts of central Europe. From the mid-16th century on, as the wars between the armies of the Lutheran north and the Catholic south raged, all manner of persecuted sects found refuge in what is now modern Poland and Hungary. There, beyond the reach of both Rome and Constantinople, if only briefly, they were allowed to practice their more radical versions of Protestantism unmolested, providing the first, even if only short lived, example of what we today would recognise as official religious toleration. In 1565, the Transylvanian Diet resolved that 'Ministers should everywhere preach and proclaim the Gospel according to their understanding of it...no one is permitted to threaten to imprison or banish anyone because of their teaching, because faith is a gift from God'. Just try doing that in Shi'a Iran or Sunni Saudi Arabia.

Poland's union with Lithuania in 1569 created a Commonwealth, comprised of Jews (!!!), Muslims (!!!!!), Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists and a medley of radical refugee sects. Sensibly recognising that political stability was best served by a policy of mutual toleration, the ruling assembly, the *Sejm*, demanded of Henry of Anjou that before his election as King, since there prevailed 'no little disagreement on the subject of religion', he had to swear an oath promising to uphold the principle that 'we who differ with regard to religion will keep the peace with one another and will not for a different faith or a change of churches shed blood or punish one another.' Again, just try that in Saudi Arabia or

Iran. Whatever the cultural relativists might say, this is an infinitely superior moral universe to the Koran's threats of the crucifixion and beheading of unbelievers, and the prophet's 'he who changes his religion, kill him'. In the opposite outer rim of north western Europe, in what is now modern Holland and England, the same first shoots of a pragmatically motivated religious toleration could be seen sprouting. Like Poland and Hungary to the east, and subsequently America, being beyond the effective reach of the big battalions of both Roman Catholicism and German Lutheranism, England, and later, Holland, served as havens for all manner of dissident currents that had separated themselves from both Catholicism and mainstream Protestantism. With the divisive persecutions of her Catholic half-sister, averaging 80 burnings a year, still fresh in her mind, Elizabeth's policy of tacit toleration - 'I have no desire to make windows into men's souls' - was even initially extended to a patriotic, quietist and outwardly conforming Catholicism. First issued in 1570, suspended in 1584, and then renewed in 1588 to coincide with the impending invasion of England by the Spanish Armada, the Bull of Pope Pius V, *Regnans in Excelsis*, declared Elizabeth to be a heretic and commanded all English Catholics to seek her overthrow. As a result, her policy of tacit toleration was increasingly difficult to sustain, because the Pope's Bull transformed all those loyal to Rome into potential traitors in the eyes of English law. And so, for political reasons more than those of doctrine, for decades to come, a somewhat circumscribed toleration was reserved only for some dissenting Protestants.

Given the ambiguities and contradictions that proliferate within Christianity's founding texts, it was always easy and tempting, especially in its earliest years, when the dogmas of the Church had yet to be fully defined, to seize on one Biblical phrase here or there, more often than not concerning property (the Bible says the followers of Jesus were communists – see Chapter 16), the Eucharist and the nature of Christ, to launch what were regarded by the clergy of the mainstream church as heretical movements. One might reasonably assume that as victims of the relentless persecution they suffered, those deemed heretics, if only for reasons of self-interest, would embrace religious toleration as a general principle. Yet only in rare cases was this so, the most notable exceptions being 16th century Poland and the Cathars of Languedoc in the early 13th century. Far more often, the persecuted believed no less fanatically than their persecutors that freedom was only for the bearers of truth, not error, and were just as intolerant of dissent within their own ranks as any Pope in his. Religious toleration in England only renewed its advance when simultaneously with the religious strife still raging in Europe, political tensions between King and Parliament erupted under Charles I. Then, having triumphed in England's counterpart to the Thirty Years War, Cromwell's religiously liberal Commonwealth not only invited back the Jews after an exile of three and half centuries, but presided over a proliferation of religious diversity unique in human history. One historian of the period has counted no fewer than 249 sects and cults, many with radical social aspirations, springing up as if from nowhere alongside the churches of mainstream Protestantism. There is nothing remotely comparable to such diversity, social radicalism or toleration in the entire history of Islam.

As is the way with a reaction to revolution, the 'restoration' of Charles II in 1660 failed to restore fully the powers of either monarchy or established church. Following the removal of his Catholic brother James, one of the first deeds of the Glorious Revolution was its Toleration Act of 1689, easing the restrictions on the non-conformist 'Dissenters'. Within the Church of England there then evolved an

easy-going 'broad church' that endures to this day, with its 'low' evangelicals and its 'high' Anglo-Catholics. In semi-officially Calvinist Holland, the overriding need for unity in the face of its Spanish Catholic enemy ensured that a policy of live and let live prevailed over a desire by the Calvinists to impose the religious uniformity that they had achieved in Geneva. By the end of the 17th century, both Holland and England were pointing the way to a time when disagreements about theology would no longer be a cause or excuse for killing. And Islam? We are still waiting.

These concessions to religious pluralism, with the very rare exception of radicals such as John Milton and William Penn, were driven more by political expediency than a genuine belief in the right to think, preach and pray differently. Consequently, the more far-reaching of these experiments in toleration were anathema not only to Rome, but the two dominant trends in European Protestantism, the Calvinist Reformers, reaching out from their stronghold in Geneva, and the Lutherans, who by this time had allied themselves with a significant number of German and Scandinavian nobles. Each sought and fought for their own freedom from Rome, but not the freedom of all to believe, preach and pray as one pleased. When religious toleration did eventually come to all Europe, the road towards it would prove long, hard, devious and bloody, taken with any number of hesitant steps and what proved to be false starts, such as the Peace of Augsburg of 1555, limiting toleration to German Catholics and Lutherans, and the Edict of Nantes of 1598 (condemned by Pope Clement VIII) to French Catholics and Calvinists, and revoked by Louis XIV in 1685. Neither endured, chiefly because their motivation was one of political expediency rather than a genuine concern for religious toleration. It was only with the rise of the Enlightenment, first in England (Milton, Penn and Locke), Scotland (Hume) and France (Voltaire), and then with the victory of the American revolution, from Jefferson and Franklin, that we hear for the first time since the pagans of Greece and Rome a reasoned advocacy for the right of all to think and speak as they wished, a right not derived from any supernatural power, but from the natural rights of man. It is a principle that Christianity, while still rejecting the secular foundations of human liberty, has had to learn to live with. Islam, totally wedded as it is to theocracy and the doctrine of the divine source of all law, ('legalisation is but for Allah') never has, does not and, possibly, cannot.

It is true geopolitical considerations were always uppermost in the religious settlements of Christianity in the early modern era. But that is the whole point. Just as the Bible says, unlike Islam, in certain matters of state, the claims of god had to take second place to those of Caesar. For example, pragmatism ruled when, ignoring the concerns of the Papacy, with which he was always at odds and at times even at war, the nominally Catholic Emperor Charles V engineered the Augsburg settlement of 1555 with the Lutherans as the only means to preserve the unity of his German empire as it battled invasions from the west by Catholic France and by its Islamic ally Turkey in the east. Secular concerns likewise were foremost at Nantes. By its treaty's terms, Huguenot-turned-nominal-Catholic Henry ('Paris is worth a mass') IV secured for France decades of civil peace after half a century of debilitating dynastic and religious strife. He had witnessed the St Bartholomew's Day massacre of Huguenots of August 1572, in which throughout France, possibly 30,000 Protestants are believed to have been murdered by Roman Catholic zealots. When the glad tidings of the massacre reached Rome, the ecstatic Pope Gregory XIII ordered a *Te Deum* to be sung, struck a commemorative medal inscribed

Uganottorum Strages ('Massacre of the Huguenots'), authorised three days of festivities celebrate it, and commissioned a mural by Vasari depicting it, which to this day, adorns one of the walls of the Vatican. As Obama might say, like Islam, Roman Catholicism has a proud tradition of tolerance.

The advance towards religious pluralism in Europe was greatly facilitated by the emergence, long before the Reformation, of institutions which, in one form or another, represented secular as well as clerical interests of a developing feudal society. Across Europe, from England in the West to Poland in the East, the three 'estates' of the realm; the church, the landed nobility, and the merchants and craftsmen of the town guilds, won the right, often by rebellion, to be consulted by the monarch in matters of high policy and finance. Such was the genesis of Magna Carta, many of whose articles would in turn lead, via the Provisions of Oxford of 1258, to the establishment of rule by a permanent, representative and law-making institution...Parliament. Across Europe, the name of similar assemblies would vary, but the purpose and the interests represented would always be the same. A society already becoming urbanised could not function without the participation and consent of the forces or 'estates' which defined and disseminated its beliefs, owned its land, commanded its armies, and generated its wealth. As later became the case with the gradual acceptance of religious pluralism, sheer necessity forced upon monarchs if not *de jure*, then *de facto*, the principle of government by consent and the rule of law - so-called 'limited monarchy'.

In time, all but the most obtuse came to recognise that the only system of governance that prospered was one that accepted not only a degree of separation of powers between those who ruled and those who made the rules, but also the inevitability of a diversity of interests, and of opinion on how best to accommodate them. It was far from being a democracy...but it was its seed bed. And it was but a short step, though as it proved not in any sense an easy one, to accepting the practical advantages of a similar accommodation with diversity in matters religious, when Luther, Zwingli and Calvin launched their challenge to the power of Rome. This tolerated jostling of competing interests, and what is crucial, the largely secular institutions that were improvised to accommodate and regulate them, has no equivalent in the history of Islam, since man-made institutions, laws and doctrines have no validity. As Azad Ali of *Unite against Fascism* (sic) and the Muslim Forum of Europe explained, 'democracy, if it means at the expense of not implementing Sharia [and it must], of course, no one [sic] will agree with that.'

How absurd can it get? A 'Muslim Council of Europe' rejecting, in the name of Islam, the principles and indeed the name of the system to which Europe gave birth; the by origin pagan idea that the *demos*, the people, and not kings and clergy, should rule itself. In the event, taking this short step from secular to religious pluralism proved impossible without a century of almost continuous bloodletting, partly because theology became entwined increasingly with a range of competing secular interests. The settlement that had proved so elusive was finally reached in 1648 with the Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years War, Europe's last great religious conflict until the break-up of Yugoslavia in the 1990s. Its cost in lives alone has been estimated at one third of Germany's population, quite apart from the economic devastation it brought in its wake. But the terms of the treaty that ended the war did bring a final religious peace to a Europe now irrevocably divided by faith. It was only able to do so because, amongst its articles were those that, looking back, we can recognise, like Magna Carta and the Provisions of Oxford in relation

to our modern Parliament, as the first enduring advance towards what western liberal democracy now takes for granted...freedom of conscience and freedom of and from religious belief. With the exceptions of the Balkans and Northern Ireland (and with regard to the latter, even here, killing has yielded to more bearable enmities) Europe, and with it the western world, has learned to live with its religious differences. This is in part due no doubt to the steady decline in the numbers of those who still believe and, among those that do, those who retain the urge to convert those that do not.

Living as we do, save for Islam, in an increasingly secular age, we can be sure that whatever other future misfortunes might lay in wait for Europe, it will not witness another Thirty Years War of Christian against Christian. Yet Islam's Thirteen Centuries War not only shows no signs of abating, it is, as I write, escalating, firstly because unlike today's Christians, a more than sufficient number of Muslims are prepared to kill and be killed for their faith, and secondly, again unlike their Christian counterparts at the time of the Reformation, secular interests are not imposing peace on the warring parties but are, as with Iran and Saudi Arabia, on the contrary, further fuelling their hatreds. What we are witnessing in not only the Middle East, the birthplace of Islam, but also in Africa and to the East, is a war between true believers. And all the signs are that this is not a conflict that will be ended, as it was in 1648 between Christians, by mutual exhaustion and *realpolitik*, but one that the religion of peace must fight to the death. Granted that the historical contrast between Christianity and Islam is not absolute. Full religious toleration among Christians did not come overnight, and it is unrealistic to expect that it could have done. The giant step forward for Europe accomplished by the Treat of Westphalia (condemned by Pope Innocent X, as heretical) was hedged in with any number of restrictions and exemptions, applying in the first place only to Roman Catholics, Calvinists and Lutherans, and even more so by the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio*, but the step had been taken and, once taken, could not be reversed without even greater bloodshed.

Unlike Catholics and Protestants, with the exception of Northern Ireland, and 'Old Firm' football matches between Glasgow Rangers and Celtic, even today, Shi'as and Sunnis find it nigh-on impossible to live together in tranquillity and mutual toleration.. And they call it the Religion of Peace? Islamic scholars have yet to account for the fact that while their faith continues to wage its two wars, against the infidel without and the heretic within, largely Christian Europe and America found their way to complete religious toleration even though this initially came about largely because for pre-eminently practical reasons, learning to live with those who thought differently was in the end seen by all but the most obtuse to make more sense than waging interminable wars and heresy hunts in pursuit of the impossible goal of making everyone think the same. This is a lesson the world of Islam has still to learn.

In addition to its ending for ever the Roman monopoly on the Christian faith in Western and Central Europe (and by extension, to all lands subject to European colonisation) the Protestant Reformation's other great, arguably greatest contribution to human progress was that by insisting on the overriding authority of the (printed) word of the Bible, it transformed, in those regions under its sway, an almost totally illiterate population into one, both male and female, that was largely literate. And this it did in the space of no more than two centuries, placing the Protestant nations at the forefront of the scientific achievements of the modern

era. Yet to this day, over half of the world's two billion Muslims remains illiterate, and of these, far more women than men, denying them the most potent means of acquiring knowledge and with it, the means of liberation from the superstition, prejudice and hatreds that plague Islamic culture.

Because Islam has proved itself incapable of embracing the western concept of religious and, more broadly, intellectual freedom, it continues, as it has done since its birth, to shed blood, and at that, mostly its own, in pursuit of goals that are chiefly defined by its theology. Contrary to Obama's absurd claim of an Islamic tolerance, the Muslim world has still to take a single step on the road to toleration even within its own divided ranks, let alone towards recognising the rights of those outside them, or to overcome one of the central obstacles to a reformed, that is to say, 'modernised', Islam; the principle that, unlike the western world which evolved out of 'Judeo-Christianity', there is no division or separation of powers between the two realms of God and Caesar. Unlike the founder of Christianity, Mohammed was both prophet *and* Caesar, and therefore, again unlike Christianity, with its 'render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's', legislation was 'not but for Allah' (*Koran*, Chapter 12, Verse 40)

Since all Islam's laws are of divine origin, and therefore not subject to change or repeal, in Islamic states, and increasingly in the Muslim diaspora beyond, politics consequently has to play second fiddle at best to theology. The only question is, whose theology? Thus we have two holy wars, not only against the infidel in the *Dar al-Harb*, the House of War, but another within *Dar al-Islam*, the House of Islam itself, not only between Sunnis and Shi'as, but between sub groupings such as Sunni ISIS, al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Should we then be surprised that it is in the heartland of the Middle East that we see Muslims still fighting today the same civil wars that erupted within its ranks after the death of its founder? The only difference is that now, it is fought with infidel technology. With Sunni Pakistan already possessing nuclear weapons and Shi'a Iran with the means to make them, the stage is being set for a thermonuclear theological melt down. Even though it has learned to curtail them, Christianity has, for most of its history, exhibited the same fanaticism, cruelty, intolerance and devotion as Islam. How else the Inquisition, martyrdom, witch and heretic burning? Following the peace of Westphalia, it would take more than another two centuries of struggle against the claims, interests and privileges of organised religion before Christendom would fully embrace, reluctantly in most cases, the religious toleration enacted, by three pagan Roman Emperors, Gallienus in AD 261, Galerius, in AD 311 and Julian in AD 327. The fact that religious toleration was first extended by pagans to Christians, but subsequently denied by Christians to pagans, tells us all we need to know about the moral pretensions of monotheism. Western civilisation...and today there is no other...owes its rise and supremacy to the establishment, in its modern form, of secular parliamentary rule, to the pagan democracy first practised by classical Greece, and the religious pluralism of pre-Christian Rome. Known as Julian the Apostate for his regression, if indeed that is what it was, to the pluralist paganism that was the rule for all emperors prior to the official (but still disputed) conversion of Constantine in AD 313 (the Edict of Milan), he is to be honoured for his readiness to tolerate and protect beliefs utterly opposed to his own:

By the Gods, I would neither have the [Christian] Galileans put to death nor scourged unjustly nor in any other manner ill-treated. Men should be taught by reason, not blows, invectives and corporal blows. I therefore again and again admonish those who embrace the true [pagan] religion in no respect to injure or insult the Galileans neither by attacks nor reproaches.

His edict on toleration is remarkable for its anticipation of a freedom of thought and belief that only truly began to come into its own with the onset of the Enlightenment in the late 17th century and the American and French Revolutions which it in part inspired. And it is in marked contrast with the vicious persecutions that ensued once Theodosius in AD 380 not only decreed Christianity to be the sole permitted faith of the Empire but also, with the aid of his Bishops, defined and enforced the single 'Nicaean' version to the exclusion of all others:

We authorise the followers of this law to assume the title of Catholic Christians; but as for the others, since, in our judgement they are foolish madmen, we decree that they be branded with the ignominious name of heretic and shall not presume to give to their conventicles the name of churches. They will suffer in the first place the chastisement of the divine condemnation, and in the second the punishment which our authority, in accordance with the will of heaven shall decide to inflict.

And so was set the course, in the name of the one, true and Apostolic Church, a church that said, and still does, that it 'cannot err', that led to the imprisonment of the European mind, to the holy terror of the Inquisition and the burning of heretical books and bodies. Faith supplanted the culture of critical thinking that made possible Aristotle, Democritus and Lucretius, that not only proved the earth was a sphere, and measured accurately its circumference, but that it revolved around the sun. While in the West those dark times of enforced ignorance and intolerance are long gone, even today, there are leading Muslim clerics who, deferring to the superior wisdom of the *Koran* in such matters, beg to differ on both counts. In 1993, the Saudi Kingdom's supreme religious authority, Sheikh Abdul-Ibn Baaz, ruled that 'The earth is flat, and whoever says it is round is an atheist deserving of punishment', while as recently as February 2015, the Saudi cleric Sheikh Bandar al-Khaibari, citing as proof Islamic holy texts, tried to convince students at a United Arab Emirates university that 'the earth is stationary' and that the sun revolves around it.

For clerics of both religions, knowledge acquired by the free exercise of mankind's faculties was to be feared, despised, spurned and suppressed, and those who sought it, punished. As Galileo and Bruno discovered in their confrontations with the Roman Inquisition, all that Christians needed to know was to be found in the Bible, just as for many Muslims even today it is contained in the *Koran*. How absurd, therefore, that it has remained an accepted, and rarely if ever challenged axiom, that the emergence and ascendancy of monotheism, god's gift to tyrants and obscurantists, marked and made possible a huge advance for mankind. What followed the cultural, legal, scientific, political, philosophical and architectural achievements of the great Pagan civilisations of Greece and Rome, their minds unfettered by infallible sacred texts, was a theologically-imposed stagnation and even decline of the Christian Dark Ages. Hard on the heels of the Christianisation of the Roman Empire came first the burning of the great library of Alexandria in 391 under Emperor Theodosius on the order of the city's Bishop Theophilus and

then, in 415, also in Alexandria, the lynching of the Greek pagan woman philosopher and mathematician Hypatia, torn to pieces by a Christian mob as a scapegoat for a dispute between the city's Governor and Bishop. These crimes against knowledge were just the beginning.

Thirteen centuries would have to pass before a Christian would re-enunciate and seek to uphold the unconditional religious toleration propounded by Julian the Apostate, when in 1672 the Quaker William Penn enshrined in the constitution of the newly founded colony of Pennsylvania the principle that no-one was to be 'molested or prejudiced for their religious persuasion or practice in matters of and worship, nor shall they be compelled at any time to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place or ministry, whatsoever.' Today in the civilised world, this exemplary principle is the norm. Not so with Islam, which where it holds legal sway, enforces its claim to superiority over all other faiths in ways that Christianity has long since been compelled to abandon. By doing so, Islam has thus far proved itself incapable of adapting to the increasingly more tolerant ways of the modern world. We still await the emergence of a Muslim Voltaire, Milton, Locke, Jefferson or Penn. And if or when one such does merge, few would bet on his or her dying of old age. Is it merely by chance that, with the questionable exception of Sufism, there is no tradition in the history of Islam comparable to Christianity's anti-clericalism? Even at its medieval peak of influence, the international institutions of the Papacy - the foundations, clergy secular and regular, diplomats, spies and mercenaries - operated alongside, and often at odds, sometimes violently so, with Europe's secular rulers, whose allegiance to Rome, even before the Reformation, was frequently nominal at best.

This latent antagonism between church and laity found its expression at all levels of society, including even the execution and murder of high churchmen by the secular power. Carnivals served as safety valves for popular irreverence, while hostility to corrupt and parasitic clergy contributed to the English Peasants' Revolt of 1381 and the Jack Cade rebellion of 1450, and was echoed by unflattering depictions of the clergy in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, Langland's *Piers Plowman*, the *Ballads of Robin Hood* and the history plays wrongly attributed to Shakespeare. At the very summit of the social and political order, the avaricious John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, (1340-99) looked with favour on Oxford academic John Wycliffe's advocacy of the secularisation of church land (prior to the Reformation, the church owned 25% of England), while on the continent, scholars such as Jean Bodin (1530-1596), Marsilius of Padua (1280-1343 and Nicolai Machiavelli (1469-1527) each advanced sophisticated arguments for the supremacy of a secular state. In the world of geopolitics, there emerged two parties in medieval northern Italy, where the claims of Papal authority clashed with those of the German emperors; namely the Papal Gelfs (who were themselves divided into 'white' and 'black' factions) and the Imperial Ghibellines. This 'north-south' divide within Catholicism survived the Reformation (of which in part it was an anticipation), taking the name of Gallicism in France and, more generally, a northern, hence 'cisalpine', devolved, conciliar Catholicism opposed to the centralist Papist party, the 'ultramontanes', that is, 'beyond the Alps'. With the rise of the nation state and the establishing of 'national' churches during and after the Reformation, the ascendancy of the secular power over the spiritual became universal, in some cases leading to a *de facto* or even, as in the USA and France, *de jure* separation of Church and state. In those nations where the Church remained loyal to Rome, as in France after the

Revolution, or Italy after unification, the ability of the Papacy to influence the political process was largely limited to launching or sponsoring Catholic parties that had to compete with their secular rivals on more or less equal terms. How different again from Islam, where there is no equivalent of the saying attributed to Jesus, 'render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's', which Luther, following St. Paul and Hosius, the fourth century Bishop of Cordoba, defined as the 'two realms' of state and church, each with its own sphere, competencies, rights and duties.

Only too aware that it lacked any Biblical endorsement for its claims to political supremacy, the Papacy invented one, the so-called 'Donation of Constantine'. The text was first cited by Pope Hadrian I in 778, in an attempt to persuade Charlemagne to follow the example of his father, Pepin the Younger, in preserving the political supremacy of the church in the Papal States. The 'Donation' in question purported to date from AD 315 and consisted of an alleged agreement by the newly converted Emperor Constantine to confer political supremacy on the papacy in all the territories of the Western Roman Empire. Doubts as to its authenticity first surfaced around the year 1000, and were vindicated in 1440, when the document was definitively exposed as a fake by the Renaissance humanist scholar, Lorenzo Valla. Islam had and has no need of such chicanery. Mohammed truly was both Pope and Caesar, as were his Caliph successors. (Iran is ruled by a 'Supreme Leader', an Ayatollah, literally, Arabic for 'sign of God'.)

While the exposure of the 'Donation' did not prevent a number of Popes from continuing to advocate and, on occasion, even attempt to impose the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power, the rise of the European nation state ensured that it remained, literally, a pious hope. Lacking not only Biblical sanction (though that has never proved an insurmountable obstacle for Catholicism) but also the wherewithal to enforce it, the death knell for Christian theocracy was sounded by the onset of the Risorgimento, which liberated the Papal States and, in 1870, Rome itself from clerical rule, leaving to the papacy sovereignty over its Vatican City, a monument to the failure of its political ambitions. These were succinctly captured in a 'Syllabus of Errors' promulgated by that Canute of Catholicism, Pious IX (1846-78), as he vainly battled to hold back the rising tides of secularism, democracy, scepticism, toleration and reason. Among what he termed the 'pests' of the modern world were 'errors concerning the church and her rights': '24: The Church has not the power of using force, nor has she any temporal power, direct or indirect' and '27: The sacred ministers of the Church and the Pontiff are to be absolutely excluded from every charge and dominion over temporal matters.' Under another heading, 'Errors about civil society, considered both in itself and in its relation to the church', we have pest number 55: 'The Church ought to be separated from the state, and the state from the church'; not an error that can be charged against those responsible for the governance of the United Kingdom. Calvin, in so many other ways more extreme than Luther in his rejection of papal teaching, in his Genevan reforms sought a system of government that in its goal, if not actual practise, ironically came close to Papal theocracy. Luther, in seeking an alliance with the anti-Papal German princes, developed a totally different system of church-state relations, one that if it were to be adopted by Islam, would mark a significant step towards an accommodation with the modern civilised world.

In his address to the Duke of Saxony of 1523, Luther cites two Biblical passages to make his case for a total separation of powers between church and state; 1 Peter, 2: 13-14: 'Be subject to every kind of human ordinance, whether to the king as

supreme, or to the governors, as to those sent by Him for the punishing of evil and for the reward of the good'; and David, in Psalm 115: 'The heavens, even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the earth he hath given to the children of men', which is exactly how the Zionists pioneers intended Israel to be governed. This division of powers, at least in theory, would mean that the state should not concern itself with errors of faith. Luther again: 'Heresy can never be prevented by force. That must be taken hold of in a different way and must be opposed and dealt with otherwise than with the sword.' According to the same principle, there would be no 'benefit of clergy', whereby the crimes of clerics would be punished, if at all, according to church law and not those of the secular state: 'Secular Christian authorities should exercise their office freely and unhindered and without fear, whether it be pope, bishop, or priest with whom they are dealing; if a man be guilty let him pay the penalty. What canon law says to the contrary is Romish presumptuousness and pure invention.'

Though in no real sense a humanist in the way of the scepticism and rationality of his contemporary sparring partner Erasmus, in this respect, Luther was forward-looking to a remarkable degree, and here too, provided a model for Islam to emulate. Reasons of state could also compel Catholic clergymen to put politics before Papal doctrine. Like Luther, the equally worldly-wise Cardinal Richelieu had understood that 'the interests of a state and the interests of religion are two entirely [sic] different things', a stance that enabled him to promote the interests of Catholic Gallicism at home while supporting the Protestant cause abroad against Hapsburg imperialism in the Thirty Years War. If an Islamic Reformation were to set itself a similar goal, it would indeed be a cause for wonder no less than celebration, because in the *Koran*, there are no 'two realms', everything on earth is rendered unto Allah. That is why in the UK, there are Muslim politicians, unlike their Christian, Jewish, Sikh and Hindu counterparts, who see their prime duty as promoting their religion rather than serving the interests of those they were elected to represent.

The *Torah* tells us that David was a shepherd, a rebel, a warrior and a King. But he was not a rabbi, neither was he a very holy man, if we are to believe the Biblical account of his deeds and appetites. Yet he, more than any other figure from the distant past, has come to symbolise the rebirth of Jewish nationhood. The Jews, so we are told, were ruled by prophets, warriors, Kings and Judges, but never by rabbis. Neither is there in the New Testament any textual foundation for a theocratic state. On the contrary, we are told that Christ's kingdom 'is not of this world' and that when offered it, he replied, 'Get behind me, Satan'. That is why, lacking any Biblical endorsement of its political ambitions, the Papacy had to fabricate one. It is here that we have the fundamental divergence. 'Judeo-Christianity', after a long and bitter struggle, has learned to live with pluralist liberal democracy and, at the very least, been brought to a grudging acceptance of the claims of secular society that are integral to it, a process analogous to the curbing of the primitive appetites of *laissez faire* capitalism by the constraints of public opinion, trade unionism and parliamentary legislation. Islam is, by its nature, all-embracing, totalitarian, the realms of Allah and Caesar as one.

As things stand at present, and have done throughout Islam's history, all its schools agree that down here on earth, Allah's undivided rule is, or rather should be, delegated to a theocratic clergy or caliph that enforces laws made by god, and not, as in western secular states, made by those democratically elected for this purpose, and administered by a secular judiciary and civil service. (For an

exposition of Shi'a Islam theocracy by Ayatollah Khomeini, see Appendix G) Those who shape and enforce the laws of the civilised world know full well that for all the claims to the contrary by clerics and conservative politicians, western legal systems owe nothing to Biblical laws, and even the most devout members of the public would have good cause for alarm if they did. This being so, repeated demands for the introduction of Sharia law into western legal systems, in some countries endorsed by more than half of their diaspora Muslims, indicate just how remote those who make these demands are from integrating into secular host societies. The case against the demands being made by theocratic Islam in the UK is undermined by the disgrace that the UK (together with Denmark and the Vatican City) shares with the 57 states of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference the indignity of still having imposed on it, in the 21st century, a state-sponsored religion, one that only a rapidly shrinking minority claims it believes in, and a far smaller one observes, and has an hereditary head of state and church who bears by divine right the title *Fidei Defensor* awarded in 1521 by Pope Leo X to Henry VIII for his anti-Lutheran tract, *Defence of the Seven Sacraments*, a title that is to this day still stamped on its coinage. How can the privileges demanded by British Muslims be fairly denied when they are uniquely accorded to the Churches of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales?

All religions share some essential features (otherwise they would not be religions) while differing in others (if they did not, there would be only one). But as we can see, Islam is different in a different way. It is not, as one Muslim reformer has claimed, 'a religion like any other'. It is a religion *sui generis*, and therefore cannot be understood, reformed and, when necessary, curbed, by making and acting on facile comparisons with other faiths. Many examples can be cited to prove this but let two suffice; firstly apostasy. In the UK, there is an organisation called the Council of Ex-Muslims of Britain. Most of its members choose, for obvious reasons, *pace* Barack Obama's 'proud history of tolerance', not to advertise their identities, while the locations of the Council's meetings are kept secret. When living in Holland, to remain alive, the outspoken Somali atheist ex-Muslim Hirsi Ali required the protection of a round-the-clock armed police bodyguard, lived in a secret location, and could only travel in an armoured vehicle. And all this simply because she left Islam and then chose to explain publicly why she had done so. And this was in Holland, not Pakistan, where open dissent from Sunni Islam will, more likely than not, result in assassination, or Saudi Arabia, for certain, with public execution. (Ironically, unlike once liberal Holland, in Sunni Tunisia and Egypt, open dissent from Islam is reasonably safe.) Those who say that Islam is a faith no less tolerant than any other, and in fact even more so, invariably cite as proof chapter 2, verse 256 of the *Koran*, that 'there is no compulsion in religion'. This proves nothing of the sort, because, according to all schools of Islamic law any infidel refusing to convert to Islam, if they are a Christian or a Jew, will either have to accept the inferior status of a *dhimmi*, or be killed, while a non-monotheist will either have to embrace Islam or be killed. A Muslim who freely chooses to leave Islam will also be killed. So much for Obama's Islamic 'tolerance'. If those who make this claim truly believe that Islam advocates, and what is equally to the point, practises a freedom of religion no less liberal than pioneered in the west by the likes of Penn, Milton, Kant, Lock and Voltaire, let them explain why it is that nowhere in the world is there an equivalent of the UK's Ex-Muslim Council that caters for those who have left any other religion, and if there were such, why

it would not find it necessary to adopt the same high-level security measures to prevent its members being murdered. (See Appendix IV: *Leaving Islam*) Those who glibly promote Islam as a religion of peace, tolerance and compassion should also ask themselves, and certainly be asked; what other religion today not only claims the right to kill all those who desert it but, as it does in Iran and Saudi Arabia, actually enforce it?

Now the second example, which relates to matters sexual. Here we have three statements by Egyptian Muslims, each of course male, that could not now be, and I firmly believe never have been, uttered by the followers, let alone clerics, of any other faith. The first was made on Egyptian TV by lawyer [sic!] Nabih al-Wahsh, who declared that it was a 'national duty' to rape a woman who showed any part of her legs in public. 'I say that when a girl walks about like that, it is a patriotic duty to sexually harass her and a national duty to rape her.' Now the second. Mazen Al Sersawi is a cleric who teaches at Cairo's prestigious Al-Azhar University. He believes that it is quite in order for the father of a daughter conceived out of wedlock to not only have sexual intercourse with, her but to marry her. 'Because an illegitimate daughter does not carry her father's name, she is not his daughter according to Sharia.' Another cleric, Muftah Mohammad Maaerouf, has argued, again on TV, that the age for marriage should be lowered to enable babies to be married off: 'In Islamic Sharia, there is no set age for females when it comes to marriage.' The problem is, what he says is correct.

Islam's relationship with modern science also places it in a world apart from countries with not only a 'Judeo-Christian tradition' but one that is pagan Greco-Roman. Yes, we in the west also have our creationist cranks, flat earthers and geocentrists, but their purchase on the world of learning is zero. However, in Saudi Arabia, because the kingdom's rulers insist on strict adherence to Koranic authority in all things, as we have seen, the clerical establishment still exerts a tight grip on the country's educational institutions, resulting in restrictions on knowledge that conflict with sacred texts. Should it be any surprise then that with a global population of 2 billion Muslims, of a total of twelve at least nominally of that faith who have won Nobel Prizes, only three, all based at western institutions, have been awarded one for science?

With the advantage of historical hindsight, it is now possible to see that the goal the Protestant reformers set themselves, that of restoring and deepening faith by emphasising reliance, thanks to Gutenberg, on the now printed word of the Bible has, contrary to their intentions, greatly contributed to the ascendancy of reason and secularism in human affairs, at least in the west. Despite attempts by state authorities to limit their numbers and regulate what they could publish, printing presses proliferated across Europe, stimulating mass literacy, while in the world of Islam, they were banned until well into the 18th century, and even then, their use confined to governmental or religious agencies. The legacy of that ban, measured in levels of illiteracy, cultural and intellectual isolation, and the stifling of free thought, is all too evident even today.

The (unintended) role played by the Reformation in the advance of secularism and reason can be measured by the remarkable differences in the prevalence of religious belief between those nations that became Protestant and those that remained Catholic. A survey of religious attitudes conducted in 2012 asked the following question: 'Are you certain god exists?' The responses, with rare but explicable exceptions, revealed a clear pattern. Those replying 'yes' had the easily

highest percentages in Catholic countries largely untouched by the Enlightenment but cowed by the Inquisition and brainwashed by the Jesuits, for example Spain 35%, Italy 41%, Poland, 62% and Ireland 64%. Protestant Sweden scored 10%, Denmark 13%, Norway 15%, and the UK 16%. An exception which proved the rule was France. Although historically mainly Catholic, beginning with the Enlightenment in the 18th century, France experienced a process of deep-going secularisation carried forward by successive revolutions and completed by a series of radical anti-clerical reforms. Not surprisingly then, France ranked with the Protestant nations, scoring only 16%. Are there forces within Islam that can generate and sustain a similar process of secularisation that in time can push back the boundaries of credulity? Let us hope so. But the prospects are not good. Islam will have proved its capacity and willingness to reform itself when can endorse in good faith the spirit, if not necessarily all the letters, of Article 9 of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, inspired by the state's founder and pioneer of absolute religious toleration, William Penn, and adopted on September 28, 1776:

All men have received from nature [not god] the imprescriptible right to worship the Almighty according to the dictates of their conscience, and no one can be legally compelled to follow, establish or support against his will any religion, or religious ministry. No human authority can, in any circumstances, intervene in a matter of conscience or control the forces of the soul.

Some Muslim scholars in the west, in their attempts to deflect or rebut the charge, supported by its sacred texts, that Islam commands actions that are both barbaric and primitive in the extreme, resort to the mumbo-jumbo of post-modernist 'deconstruction', the central axiom of which is the denial of the possibility of knowing objective reality. Few would dare go as far as Ahamed Vanya, a Fellow of the American Islamic Forum for Democracy, and for his courage alone, he deserves credit. A little defensively, he concedes that 'while it is true that there are eternal principles in the *Koran* and the *Hadith*, such as peace [sic], justice [sic] and mercy [sic], and therefore incumbent on everyone [presumably he means only Muslims] to believe and practice at all times and all places', there are others, which, although recorded in the 'authentic traditions', such as *Hadith*, should nevertheless be taken with a 'pinch of salt'. Well now! Let us first readily grant that many of these so-called 'authentic traditions' are indeed as he claims, suspect, even spurious. It is also perfectly true that ever since the compilation of *Hadith* began in the early centuries of Islam, disputes raged, and still do, amongst Islamic scholars as to the authenticity of some of the various competing collections of the purported sayings and deeds of the prophet. But never about either the authenticity or perfection of the *Koran* itself, of which there is only one 'official' or 'approved' Arabic version, which was canonized as such under the rule of the Third Caliph Uthman ibn Affan in the mid seventh century. All other versions were ordered destroyed, leaving Uthman's alone as the true word of Allah, to be accepted as such without question and without subtraction or addition, forever, by all Muslims. In this text are to be found Islam's 'eternal principles', to be obeyed, as Vanya agrees, 'at all times and all places'. But is it not the case that beheading, together with crucifixion, wife beating, marital rape, Jew hatred, burning alive, slavery and limb amputation, are sanctioned not only in the suspect 'authentic traditions' but in the *Koran* itself?

This is the great obstacle, possibly insurmountable, to the reform of Islam. Those who seek a more liberal version of Islam seem to be suggesting, without it being stated explicitly, that Allah's message, depending on its place, time, source and context, either must be obeyed without question or can be safely ignored. The problem is one that we have already encountered...which text is which? Ahamed Vanya wisely leaves this problem unexplored, for here he sails dangerously close to the fatal winds of heresy. We are simply told that 'any text by its nature is finite and limited'. What? 'Any text'? Even the *Koran*, which, so its author says, is the undiluted, infinitely wise, perfect, timeless, eternal word of Allah himself, limited by nothing, and which Vanya himself therefore proclaims to be valid 'at all times and places? Surely not. So how then can a Muslim adapt Islam to the needs of modern society, which is the purpose of the exercise? He says one must 'contextualise', that is, see and explain the sacred texts of Islam in the 'context' of the place and time when they were first created. Yes, indeed. That is also exactly what a non-believer would do. But Vanya is not a non-believer. Also bear in mind the crucial difference that unlike a non-believer, a believer in any of the three monotheisms is constrained by what the belief requires, and demands, the believer to believe, namely, that in this case the *Koran*, the founding text is not a product of human social forces acting in a 'context' of an historical place and time, but, as it says about itself, is a perfect work of a perfect, divine being, Allah, and as such, timeless, placeless and therefore, of necessity, contextless.

To avoid what can be fatal accusations of heresy, Vanya resorts to post-modernist literary analysis, which argues that the original intended meaning of a text, in this case the *Koran*, dies with its creator and so can never be known by those that come after. But Mohammed was not the creator of the *Koran*, only its 'messenger'. Its 'author' was Allah, who created a text that unlike any other, was a message to all people of all times and of all places. So when Vanya says its text is open to any number of 'readings', each as valid - or invalid - as those of a text of secular origin, he is opening the door to apostasy, with fallible human minds contending endlessly, and with no means of proof, over the true intended meaning of a text that its divine author has inexplicably failed to make sufficiently explicit. Released from the bonds of Koranic inerrancy, the schools or versions of Islam could in theory multiply to infinity. And yes, something like this did happen to Christianity after the great schism brought about by the Protestant Reformation. Today, the number of versions of a once unified faith, officially at least, under Constantine, is said to be in excess of 40,000. But Islam, for the reasons stated, has not undergone anything remotely like a similar doctrinal fission.

It would be foolish to deny that over time, the meanings of certain words can change, or come to mean very different things in different settings and cultures, especially when they refer to abstractions. 'Democracy' is a very good example. One only has to think of an Athenian democracy that co-existed with slavery and a Stalinist 'People's Democracy' that allowed only one party, or a democracy, as in France until 1945 and Switzerland until 1971, which denied votes to women, and in the USA, one which until the passage of two civil rights acts in 1964 and 1965, also denied black citizens in certain states the right to vote. It is however possible to understand by reference to their usages and yes, 'context', what words meant to those who first coined and used them, again, as with the ancient Greeks, how they understood the meaning of the word democracy.

Certain words or terms, by virtue of what they describe or convey, unless they are used metaphorically, simply cannot change their meaning. For example, human body parts are the same today as when the *Koran* first instructed its readers to sever them as a punishment for certain crimes. A woman's nervous system feels pain just as much today as it did when Allah supposedly sanctioned female genital mutilation, and beating as a punishment for disobedient wives. 'Beat', whatever Islamic websites might claim to the contrary, still means the same today as it did in the seventh century, as does crucify and cut about the neck. Yet it is precisely the meanings of such words, about which there can absolutely no doubt, which the 'contextualisers' seek to subvert in order to render Islam more compatible with modern thinking on marital relations and crime and punishment. By prioritising a transitory 'context' over an unchanging text, the latter is conveniently denied the ability to retain or convey its originally intended meaning outside of and beyond the time and 'context' in which it was created, and in doing so, loses its authority to guide or influence human actions. Thus rendered opaque or infinitely ambiguous, which amounts to the same thing, the text and, it follows, its creator, Allah, cannot therefore be held responsible for the crimes now being committed in his name, because, having endowed mankind with discerning minds, he expects his followers to make the necessary adjusts to the times and places in which they live. As one Muslim Brotherhood theologian, Tariq Ramadan, put it so succinctly, the fault lies with the reader, not with the text that is read. So, when searching for the causes of Jihadi terrorism, apologists for Islam advise us to look anywhere but in the texts that inspire it. Prominent among such frequently cited causes are:

Poverty: Despite the immense wealth of its financiers and the middle-class profiles of most Muslim terrorists and, not least, the total absence of any reference to Muslim poverty in any Jihadi manifestos or proclamations.

'Alienation': But again, most Jihadis are either professionals, students or graduates, and come from settled family backgrounds.

Racism: For the nth time, Islam is a religion, not a race. Moreover, Muslim terrorists come from a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds.

The legacy of western colonialism: This ignores the far longer period of Ottoman rule over the Arabs of the Middle East and North Africa, which has not resulted in Islamic terrorist attacks on officially secular Turkey. And this does not explain more numerous acts of terror confined to Muslim countries.

And of course, the crimes of Zionism. The problem here is, Israel has only existed since 1948. The many passages in the *Koran* that incite hatred against the Jews date from the seventh century

11 Where the Penis Never Softens

All Muslim scholars and historians of Islam concur that from its very inception, the faith has been characterised not only by violent internal strife but a no less violent succession of external Jihadi conquests. And in view of its integral anti-Semitism, we should not be unduly surprised that Islam fought its first war against the Jews, not in 1948 to prevent the creation of Israel, but in 627 AD at Medina where, according to Islamic tradition, Mohammed wrecked a terrible vengeance on the Jewish Qurazah tribe who had, so it is claimed, sided with his Meccan enemies at the 'Battle of the Trench'. After his victory, the same accounts tell us he slaughtered, as was his rule, all the men and enslaved the children and the women, a practice which the *Koran* legitimises in Chapter 8, *Al Anfal*, meaning 'The Spoils of War', as in Verse 2: 'They ask thee concerning the spoils. Say, "the spoils of war are for Allah and the Messenger.' This citation begs the question...why should a religion of peace require a chapter of its holy book devoted exclusively to 'the spoils of war'? (For more details, see Appendix E, *Spoils of War*.)

Spurious causes for Muslim violence are legion. I have listed above some of the most frequently cited by *kuffar* Islamic apologists. But however long this list, one factor in the equation, without which there would be no suicide bombings, massacres, hijackings, crucifixions, rapes, beheadings and kidnappings, is nearly always missing: Islam and its teachings on *Jihad*. Has it never occurred to those who think such up such causes that while there must be countless millions of non-Muslims who conform to the profiles ascribed to the typical Muslim terrorist, none of them has flown a passenger jet into a skyscraper, blown themselves up on a bus, in a mosque, church, tube train, or cafe, machine gunned Jewish children outside a school, journalists in an office or tourists on a beach, or beheaded, enslaved, raped, buried and burned alive or crucified someone of a different religion or a wrong version of their own? The insistence that Islam has nothing to do with terrorist crimes carried out by self-proclaimed Muslim Jihadis in the name of Islam is no less absurd than an historian claiming that Roman Catholicism had nothing to do with the Inquisition, National Socialism with the Holocaust, or Bolshevism with the Stalinist terror. Implicit in this denial of Islam as the prime motivating factor in terrorist acts carried out by Muslims is the arrogant assumption by those that make it is that they know better than the terrorists themselves what the terrorists actually believe in, and what they are thinking when they act as they do. They are therefore unable to explain why it is that Muslim suicide bombers frequently make martyrdom videos just prior to their self-immolation, videos which express their total dedication to the cause of Islam, and a certainty that their self-sacrifice will be rewarded, just as the *Koran* and *Hadith* promise, by everlasting sensual delights in Paradise, or account for the fact that on those few occasions when would-be suicide bombers are arrested before they accomplish their goal, they almost invariably confirm that this was the promise made to them by those that trained and sent them on their sacred mission.

And yet there is ample evidence from Arab Middle Eastern sources that as part of their preparation, prospective suicide bombers would have been told, or perhaps if literate, read for themselves in their holiest book, that on completing their mission

and arriving in paradise, they would find themselves 'reclining on couches in rows' and have 'as companion's fair maidens, having wide, beautiful eyes'. (*Koran*, Chapter 52, Verse 21) Reading on, the aspiring martyr would learn that 'For the God-fearing awaits a place of security, gardens and vineyards, and maidens with swelling breasts, like of age, and a cup overflowing'. (78: 31-34) With an infinity of time on their hands, should our Jihadi martyrs desire a change of company then, with more than a hint of homo-eroticism, there is always the prospect that there will 'wait upon them youths of their own, pure as though they were pearls, well preserved'. (Chapter 52, Verse 25) In addition to sodomy, we have another delight on offer that is forbidden to Muslims here on planet earth, though judging by the absence of the usual after-effects, it could well be of the alcohol-free variety: 'In the gardens of Bliss, seated on thrones, facing one another, they will be served around with a cup from a flowing fountain, sparkling white wine, delicious to the drinkers, wherein there will be no intoxication, nor will they be exhausted thereby.' (32:44-8) Just as well, because for company, our celestial boozers will have 'chaste women with restrained looks and large beautiful eyes'. (37: 49) Various *Hadith* elaborate on these themes, one of the most explicit being the 'soft porn'-styled Al-Itqan Fi Ulum al Qu'ran, p.351:

Each time we sleep with a *houri* we find her virgin. Besides, the penis of the Elected never softens. The erection is eternal; the sensation that you feel each time you make love is utterly delicious and out of this world and were you to experience it in this world you would faint. Each chosen one will marry seventy [sic] *houris*, beside the women he married on earth, and all will have appetising vaginas.

In this *Hadith*, we seem to be two *houris* light, but not to worry, as the deficit has been made good by enrolling the services of wives. And presumably, in paradise as on earth, they cannot say no. But here there is a problem, because despite its being a 'perfect book' with each of its verses 'mutually supporting' the rest, the *Koran* cannot seem to make up its mind whether or not wives are to share with their husbands the delights of paradise. In another verse, those fallen warriors favoured by Allah will be 'seated on couches inwrought with gold and jewels, reclining thereon and facing each other', while there 'wait on them youths who will not age, carrying goblets and ewers and cups filled out of a flowing spring', 'carrying such fruits as they choose and flesh of birds as they desire'. (56: 16-22) This is obviously a wife-less gathering, because on offer are 'fair maidens with wide, lovely eyes like pearls well-preserved, as a reward for what they did'. (56: 23-25) 'What they did' was to have fought and died for the cause of Allah. So it seems from this account that we what have here is a combination of a brothel, an eternal Sharia stag party and an Islamic Valhalla. Chapter 52, Verses 20-25, presents the same picture: 'And He will say to them, eat, drink with happy enjoyment because of what you used to do'. [so, again, clearly a reward for retired Jihadis.] 'On that day, they will be reclining on couches arranged in rows. And We shall give them as companion's fair maidens, having wide, beautiful eyes.' Confirmation, if any were needed, that this is also a no-wives affair is to be found in the next two verses: 'And they will turn to one another, asking questions. And they will say, "before this, when we were among our families, we were very much afraid of Allah's judgement"'. (52: 26-7) So where *are* their families, especially their wives (either singular or plural)? Here the plot thickens, because we read in Chapter 43, Verse 71, the following: 'Enter ye

the Garden, you and your wives, honoured and happy'. But, just as previously, 'there will be passed around to them dishes of gold and cups, and therein will be all that the souls desire and which the eyes delight. And therein you will dwell for ever.' 'all that that the souls desire' maybe...but not the flesh. For where are the 'fair maidens' with their 'wide, beautiful eyes', 'appetising vaginas' and 'swelling breasts'?

And the confusion continues. In Chapter 38, Verses 51,53 we see 'the righteous' being entertained by 'chaste women with their eyes downcast [that is, submissive and compliant], companions of equal age', but Chapter 36, Verses 56-7 of Allah's 'perfect book' has 'the inmates [sic] of Heaven', namely 'they and their wives', 'reclining on raised couches' in 'pleasant shades' with not a *houri* in view. What is, or is not, going on? Finally, we have a third permutation on the same theme. To recapitulate, according to the 'perfect' *Koran*, first we had a men-only paradise resembling a stag-party with escorts thrown in; then a paradise for married couples or permitted multiples of the same but minus the holy hookers. Now we have what seems to be a singles or swingers option: 'But who does good, whether male or female, and is a believer, these will enter the Garden; they will be provided therein with measure.' (40: 41)

Moving on from the confusions of the *Koran* as to what exactly is on offer for today's aspiring suicide bomber, we find *Hadith* advertising a range of competing bordello paradises, each with its own unique brand of carnal gratifications. One *Hadith* which promises that new arrivals will be 'coupled with seventy-two spouses from the wide-eyed maidens of paradise', is easily outbid by another, which guarantees that all 'shall be married off to four thousand virgins, eight thousand slave girls and one hundred wide-eyed virgins of paradise and seventy of his inheritance from the people of hell fire.' Should any aspiring martyr booking this particular package entertain any doubts as to his physical ability to rise to the challenges presented to his genitals he will be set at rest by the small print, which reassures him that he will discover that his 'arousal never wavers', a Sharia Viagra no less, that could be promoted as 'Shiagra' or perhaps even the more *risqué* 'Shagra'. Al-Ghazzali (1058-1111), the most authoritative of all Sunni scholars, provides a description of Paradise's facilities so detailed as to have been derived from first-hand experience:

These places are built of emeralds and jewels and in each building, there will be seventy rooms of red colour and in each room seventy sub-rooms of green colour and in each sub room there will be one throne and over each throne seventy beds of varied colours and on each bed a girl having sweet black eyes. There will be seven girls in each room. Each believer will be given such strength in the morning as he can cohabit with them.

Thus, 168,070,000 couplings per night. Muslim capers in paradise are wonderful material for comedians, as with many other goings-on in this often-preposterous belief system...but who in their right mind would dare? So much for the men, with their penises that never soften. But what of their wives, and women generally? Here, as we have already noted with the *Koran*, there is ambiguity in the sources. In some, wives are described as having to share their men folk with a never-ending supply of re-cycled virgins. In other accounts, they are absent. Either way, the Muslim Paradise, as one would expect, is a very male affair. Perhaps part of the

answer as to the whereabouts of wives is to be found in a famous *Hadith* of the prophet, recorded in Bukhari 10521: 'The prophet said; "I saw the Hell-Fire and I had never seen such a horrible sight. I saw that most of the inhabitants were women."'. Claims have been made, some in jest, others with the intention of presenting Islam in as sane light as possible (no easy task, as the above citations demonstrate), that the promise of 72 virgins or houris is a mistranslation, that it should read 72 raisins. If so, these must be raisins like no others, because they have sprouted sweet black eyes, swelling breasts and appetising vaginas, while their consumption requires an ever-erect penis.

Muslims understandably can be a little touchy about this subject, as proved to be the case when Louis Smith, an Olympic gymnast, posted a short video of himself and two friends sending up certain aspects of Islam, including the reward of virgins in paradise, which he numbered at only sixty. Father Ted and Dave Allen in their time had made careers lampooning similar nonsense peddled and antics performed by the Roman Catholic Church without suffering any adverse consequences from the Vatican. But this was Islam. Within hours, Mohammed Shafiq, Chief Executive of the Ramadan Foundation, had pounced. Islam was no laughing matter: 'I think he [Smith] should apologise immediately.' And of course, after being bombarded with protests from Smith's politically correct fans, and perhaps also with the fate of the *Charlie Hebdo* staff in mind, that is what he did: 'I recognise the severity [sic!] of my mistake [not presumably his short-changing the number of virgins] and hope it can be used as an example of how important it is to respect others at all times.' Not only as a punishment for the offender, but we must assume *pour discourager les autres*, Smith was suspended for three months by the UK's ruling athletic body, *just for making a joke about a religion*.

Evidently, those who govern the affairs of UK athletics deemed it is necessary to conform to the principle enunciated by Corbyn in Trafalgar Square on February 12, 2006, that everyone must 'show respect for each other's faith', faiths which many cannot 'respect' without betraying beliefs they themselves hold dear. Had it never occurred to Corbyn that different faiths and secular-based convictions exist precisely because they do not share, and, therefore 'respect', many of the core assumptions of other belief systems? How can an observant Jew for example 'respect' the belief incumbent on a Christian that Jesus was the true Messiah, or a Muslim that he was the crucified son of god, or all three that the myriads of Hindu gods actually exist, or an atheist that the universe was created around 6,000 years ago by an entity called god in six days, the first three without any sun (created on the fourth day) by which they could be measured? For its enforcement, the Corbyn principle requires a Respect Police that outwardly at least, will compel respect for beliefs we do not share, to detect and punish those who laugh or joke about beliefs we find amusing or even ludicrous, and criticise those religious practices we abhor, for example, *Koran* and *Hadith*-sanctioned terrorism, anti-Semitism, child abuse, homophobia and misogyny.

Whatever Smith's real opinion on the matter might have been, Mohammed Shafiq's was that even respect by non-Muslims for Islam was simply not enough: 'Our faith is not to be mocked, our faith is to be celebrated'. 'Celebrated'? Since Muslims already do so, then 'celebrated' by whom exactly? Why, by non-Muslims of course. Non-Muslims must 'celebrate' a faith they do not share, and in some cases, fear and/or despise, whose holy book (8:55) describes them as 'the vilest of animals', and that a growing number of infidels, a majority in nearly every

European country, believes is incompatible with the values and institutions of western civilisation. And can one imagine the reverse, of Christians, Jews and Hindus demanding that Muslims celebrate their respective faiths, and no less improbably, Muslims agreeing to do so? We will in due course encounter Mr Shafiq again when he defines the Ramadan Foundation's definition of what constitutes free speech.

Joking aside, the authenticated sources for the pleasures that await Muslim warriors in the afterlife, while certainly differing widely in detail, all agree that Paradise offers a sumptuously erotic life-style denied to all but the most privileged of their faith on planet earth, like for example, one of Corbyn's Jihadi 'friends', the billionaire Hamas leader, Khaled Marshaal, relaxing, so Egyptian TV delighted in showing its viewers, by the swimming pool of his seven-star Qatar hotel with his permanently on-tap team of Russian prostitutes...or should it be *houris*? And those in the west who have been duped by the Palestinian Authority's pose of reasonableness and moderation, even to the extent of according it diplomatic recognition, might be surprised to learn that it too entices young men and even boys to sacrifice their lives in 'martyrdom' missions against Israeli Jews with the promise of sexual bliss in Paradise, as in a PA TV transmission of March 21, 2015. A mother explains her feelings about the loss of her son in one such operation: 'It's our duty to give ourselves and our children. Praise Allah, it's true that this hurts, and that we feel agony and pain. [But] It's [also] true what they say, that we ululate [make sounds of joy] for our dead children because our child is going to heaven to marry the dark-eyed virgins, Allah willing.' On November 7, 2015, the PA daily, *Al-Hayat Al-Jaddida*, carried the following item: 'Minister of Women's Affairs Haifa Al Agha noted the Palestinian woman's uniqueness, which differentiates from the women of the [rest of the] world, as only she receives news of her son's martyrdom with cries of joy'. This was voice of the Palestinian Authority, be it noted, not Hamas or the Islamic State, recognised by 138 states, only 28 less than Israel, the same 'authority' with which Israel has to negotiate a 'two-state solution' to the Palestine question

It must be hard for those (mainly, but not exclusively, of the Sharia left) to accept the evidence that the chief, if not only motive for 'martyrdom missions' is not the desire to create a more just society down here on earth, or even strike a blow against Israel or 'western imperialism', but the gratification in paradise of urges and appetites which, thanks to their religion, this world, except for a privileged few, generally denies them. The most elementary common sense compels us to accept that only a truly, and not outwardly devout Muslim parent would in the first place believe in the existence of this holy whorehouse in the sky and, what is more, offer up their (male) children so they could gain admittance to it. And if, as we are invited to believe, that being a religion of peace, Islam is to be excluded as a factor contributing to such acts of 'martyrdom' (carried out nevertheless by Muslims in the name of Islam), then we must also accept the absurd proposition that such acts, when perpetrated, as they sometimes are, by new converts to Islam, would have been carried out by them even if they had not converted to it. Take the case of Elton Simpson, one of the two Muslims killed by police in their thwarted attack on the free speech 'Draw Mohammed' event in Garland, Texas, on May 3, 2015. Simpson had converted to Islam while still at school, and then came to the attention of the Federal authorities when suspected of intending to travel to Somalia on a Jihadist mission. Speaking after Simpson's death in the abortive Garland attack, his attorney

said that 'he was a normal guy, a normal kid. He was kind and respectful. The only [sic] thing that would stand out was that he was a devout Muslim.' But this 'only' was enough to turn Simpson, just like so many others like him, into an assassin.

To take another, identical, case, and like all the others, a tragic one for all concerned, that of Brusthom Ziamani. Brought up in the UK by a family of Jehovah Witnesses, a faith noted for its pacifism and complete disinterest in politics, after converting to Islam, he at once decided to emulate the murder of Fusillier Lee Rigby in September 2013 by two other recent converts to Islam, both of whom Ziamani revered as 'legends'. Surely this alone, the explicit desire to emulate two idolised Muslim assassins and would-be 'martyrs', should suffice as proof that Ziamani saw himself as a Muslim Jihadi, not as a conventional 'secular' would-be murderer who, for no apparent reason, one day took it into his head to kill at random the first British soldier he came across. Granted that his behaviour certainly resembled in certain respects that of a psychopath. But its cause was not clinical mental disorder, but religious faith. Ziamani was not a psychopath, but your typical western Jihadi Muslim. When arrested as a terrorist suspect, he was carrying a bag containing a 12-inch knife, a hammer...and an Islamic flag. Before his arrest, he had posted on line not only a list of his intended victims, including gays, lesbians and British soldiers, but also, following the example of ISIS, Shi'a Muslims. What possible motive could he have had for wanting to kill specifically *Shi'a* Muslims other than the theological? Finally, Ziamani proclaimed that like his hero killers of Lee Rigby, he 'was willing to die for Allah'. What more proof could there possibly be that his intended actions were motivated exclusively by his religious beliefs? Brusthom Ziamani was, like so many other essentially decent young men who have been transformed by conversion to Islam into aspiring or actual assassins, a tragic figure, who is now serving a 22-year jail sentence that will effectively destroy his entire life and bring immeasurable grief to his parents. Surely it is high time the infidel West acknowledged and acted on the truth that *Jihad* is as central to Islam as belief in the resurrection of Jesus is to Christians. (See Appendix L for the proof)

Those who, like Obama and Hilary Clinton, in an attempt to avoid offending what we might call 'world Muslim opinion', have denied the obvious connection between Islam and terrorism, need to be asked; what is the statistical likelihood of every known instance of a suicide attack, starting with 9/11, being carried out exclusively by those describing themselves as Muslims? Any expert in probability theory will tell them that the chances of this are so remote as to be neigh-on incalculable. They will be told, just accept the only plausible conclusion, that the virtual one to one correlation between becoming a suicide bomber and being a Muslim is not due to pure chance, but to the Muslims in question believing they had a sacred duty to wage *Jihad*. Of course, not all Muslims are Jihadis, though at the very least, as a number of surveys have shown, hundreds of millions of Muslims who are not still approve of their actions, since it is integral to their faith. *But all suicide bombers are Muslims*. So what are we to make of President Obama's repeated denials of there being any connection whatsoever between terrorism practised by those describing themselves as Muslims, and the actual 'religion of peace'?

One particularly lamentable example must suffice: 'Islam is not part of the problem in combating violent extremism; it is an important part of promoting peace'. Not part of the problem? Promoting peace? Let us quote again from Chapter Eight, Verse Thirteen of the *Koran*: 'I will cast terror into the hearts of those who

disbelieve.' Yes, *terror*. Perhaps Obama had been persuaded that as with the *Koran's* injunction to beat disobedient wives, there is here too an alternative 'reading' beneath the 'surface', one that transforms these words into the opposite of what they seem to say. How else could he truly believe not only that the world would still be plagued by this 'violent extremism' even if Islam did not exist, but given that it does, that Islam is part of the solution for its elimination?

Obama is an intelligent, well-educated man, which renders it all the more incongruous that he should have lauded a religion so utterly opposed in every respect to his own domestic policies, which have been arguably the most liberal of any US President in history. So the motive for his public stance on Islam can only be, we must assume, political expediency, and not one of genuine conviction. Otherwise, how else to explain for example his courageous support for the legalisation of same-sex marriage, a measure that overcame fanatical opposition from domestic Christian bigots, but would be unthinkable in states ruled by Sharia law, where homosexuality, legal in every western country, carries a mandatory death sentence?

We must also ask...what is the nature of this 'extremism' whose name, to paraphrase Oscar Wilde on the love between homosexuals, not only Obama, but nearly all infidel politicians, dare not speak? Jihadis do not do what they do 'in the name of terrorism', as Prime Minister Cameron so fatuously claimed after the murder of Fusillier Lee Rigby by two recent converts to Islam. Often as not, at the very moment of their martyrdom, they cry out 'God is great', never, 'terrorism' or 'extremism' is great. Likewise, Obama's term 'violent extremism' on its own means nothing and, one suspects, is meant to. We all know what violent means. 'Violent' is an adjective, describing a noun, in this case, an action, such as a blow, that applies a substantial degree of force to its object, which can be either animate or inanimate, in this context obviously the former. But until we know something about the nature of this 'extremism' in addition to its being 'violent', the phrase remains in a void, lacking any specific meaning. Obama could have just as easily said 'extremist violence', and we would have been no more the wiser. To be 'extreme' in relation to something can be an entirely commendable quality, as in extremely industrious, honest, kind, loving etc.

Before we can 'combat' this 'extremism', we need to be able to identify what it is that is extreme. There has to be an extreme *something*. Otherwise, we are just chasing shadows. The same applies to violence. Violent *what*? The world is full of violence, some of it man-made, but most of it deriving from natural causes, such as earthquakes, storms, etc. The same is true of extremes, such as those generated by climate. Juxtaposing these two terms, whether as nouns or adjectives, gets us nowhere. Violent extremism? Extreme violence? What are the specific, unique distinguishing features of this 'extremism' in addition to its being 'violent', that will ensure that we are 'combating' the right one? For Obama's sentence to make any sense, we need an adjective to describe the 'extremism', Islamic, or a noun to denote what it is that is violent, Islam. But for reasons that are as obvious as they reprehensible, the President of the United States did not see fit to provide either. This demeaning game of semantic blind man's bluff, has one purpose only, and that is to evade saying what everyone knows to true, that the 'violent extremism' he is referring to has its origins in Islam, as even a brave few Muslims agree, and it is being perpetrated exclusively by Muslims. Some, unlike Obama, do indeed admit to the existence of a specifically Islamic 'extremism' or 'fundamentalism', one that

is exclusively responsible for all the crimes and 'excesses' committed in the name of the true faith, a so-called 'Islamism'. But those that do use these terms still insist that the thus traduced parent doctrine is peaceful. But surely, if that is the case, should it not follow that the more 'extreme' (or devout) a Muslim is, or the more he or she remains true to its 'fundamentals', that is, core teachings, the more peaceful they will be, given that these teachings are themselves 'peaceful'? (Thus the mantra, repeated after Jihadi atrocities, that Islam is a 'religion of peace'.)

In the light of his state of denial on the subject, one hopes that Obama's intelligence service translated and forwarded to him the following analysis of the relationship between Islam and Jihadi terrorism: 'When the people of ISIS perpetrate slaughter, murder, rape, immolation and all those barbaric crimes, they say they are relying on the Sharia, they say that this based on a certain Koranic chapter, on a certain saying of Ibn Taymiyyah, or on some historical event. To tell the truth, everything ISIS says is correct.' These are the thoughts, not of a raging 'Islamophobe', but of a *Muslim* journalist, Ibrahim Eissa, during an Egyptian Television broadcast of February 3, 2015. One would have thought that this is an example of just the kind of straight talking that Obama, if he had been serious about soliciting the support of Muslims in the fight against 'extremism', would have welcomed with open arms. Not a bit of it. He preferred the advice of the theocratic Muslim Brotherhood, creator and ally of Hamas and sworn enemy of Egypt's reformers and secularists. Yet Obama, as recent US Presidents go, was not an especially devout man. He had for example, and this was to his credit, unlike some of his predecessors and political opponents, publicly avowed his agreement with evolution.

So, the great mystery remains...why could he not see, or admit, that religion motivates people to do great harm just as easily, and especially with Islam, often more easily, as it can to do good? Why this intellectually pathetic, almost despairing attempt always to attribute no religious motives to actions that no averagely intelligent and sane person, confronted with the evidence, would attribute to anything else? In one of his many attempts to separate Jihadism from any connection with Islam, he made a quite truly extraordinary statement. Despite its name, the Islamic State could not be Islamic, because 'no [sic] religion condones the killing of innocents'. Really? We can assess this (preposterous) claim in a number of ways, and then dispense with those that will lead onto false paths. Firstly, when Obama says 'no religion' is he referring a) to its teachings as defined by its foundational texts; b) the behaviour of those who claim to adhere to them or c) the religion's institutions? Surely given the context, Obama must mean a religion's teachings, because its adherents, being mere mortals, will inevitably err in their behaviour. Since they too are comprised of fallible mortals, the same applies to institutions, with the exception of the Catholic church, which, having being founded by the son of god, says it 'cannot err'. (If so, how come then its admittedly somewhat belated *mea culpa* for its persecution of Galileo?) All things considered therefore, our concern is primarily with teachings.

Let us put aside for the moment Islam, with its Koranic commands to wage war against the infidel and its law that punishes apostates with death, the Aztecs, with their human sacrifices to Teotl, and the gladiatorial contests of pagan Rome, and focus instead on Obama's own religion, Christianity. (He is a member of the vehemently anti-Zionist Congregationalist Trinity United Church of Christ.) Since his statement, seemingly so straightforward and to a believer, self-evidently true, is

in fact open to a number of interpretations, each in its own way problematic, we must first ask: are we to infer from Obama's claim that not one of the 100,000 or so women condemned and burned to death as witches from the 16th to the 18th century was an 'innocent', because they were punished in accordance with the Bible's 'suffer not witches to live', Exodus 28: 2? Belief in the existence of witches, and that they consorted with Satan, was given official endorsement by the Papal Bull of Innocent (sic) VII in 1484, followed by the publication in 1486 of the witch-hunters guide, *Compendium Maleficarum*, the demand for which was so great that it went through 30 more editions. If witches, defined by the Church as women (of course) being in league with Satan, have never existed, even though the Bible says they do (for why else the prescribed punishment) and that therefore all the women so accused, convicted and burned were, beyond any doubt, 'innocents', then it surely follows that not only the Churches who burned them were guilty of an appalling crime, but even more so, the religion that demanded their execution.

We can be sure that Obama, whom, it is safe to assume, does not believe in witches, did not intend to lead us to this conclusion. But there is no way round it. Either, as the Bible says, witches do exist, and god is justified in wanting them killed, or they do not, in which case god is not merely condoning, but demanding the killing of innocents. It also transpires that Obama's god is a killing god for demanding the putting to death of people for doing things that US law today would in most cases find to be legal. Let me explain. For a Protestant such as Obama is, it is the Bible, and the Bible alone, which contains the true word and teachings of god. Like his deeds, most of god's laws are to found in the Old Testament, in the five books of Moses. The third, Leviticus, and fifth, Deuteronomy, specify a considerable number of acts that god had forbidden the Jews to commit, and were to be punished by death. Leviticus lists them as follows: in Chapter 20, there are nine, in Chapter 23, one, and in 24, three. In Deuteronomy, there are three in Chapter 13, two in Chapter 17 and five in Chapter 22. Between them, the two books specify 23 acts that are punishable by death with one, incest, by burning alive (Leviticus 20:14) and the rest, where it is specified, by stoning. The acts so listed are mainly either of a sexual or a religious nature, the latter mainly to do with apostasy, but they also include the sin of working on the Sabbath, which Obama surely must have done while President, as in Leviticus 23:30.

Most Christians today are either totally ignorant of these provisions or, if they are not, 'cherry pick' their way round them, or claim that the New Testament has in some way abrogated them with a more humane dispensation. They could not be more mistaken. Those who argue thus are ignorant of the words ascribed to Jesus in Mathew Five, Verses 17 and 18: 'Think not that I came to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, until it be fulfilled.' And in James, 3 Verse 10: 'For whosoever shall keep the law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all'. Such are the commands of Jehovah, binding therefore not only on observant Jews, but also on all true Christians. They are unchangeable, because the god of the Bible, being perfect and all knowing, unlike Allah, always gets things right the first time, and admits of no ambiguities or abrogations in his holy book. Yet most of the acts judged by the Bible to be punishable by death would today, in any civilised country, not even be considered crimes at all, let alone subject to capital punishment. Only three of the Ten Commandments, those forbidding murder, theft and lying (this can be a crime under

certain conditions) feature in modern western criminal codes, while many of those that do, for example bigamy, rape and paedophilia, are missing. In the eyes of the law, if not of god, those violating any of the rest would now, to use Obama's term, be 'innocents'. So, one has to choose. One cannot have it both ways. Since they are in so many respects in conflict with each other, either most of god's laws, or our laws, are wrong. The question then is, are those judged to be innocent by our laws 'innocents' in the eyes of Obama? If yes, then religion has indeed been and in the case of Islam, still is killing innocents, and Obama's claim therefore is wrong.

I suspect that Obama's fatally flawed assertion that religions do not kill innocents was motivated by his stated conviction, shared as it is by nearly all the western world's politicians, that atrocities committed in the name of Islam by those describing themselves as Muslims are not motivated by their belief in or derived from the faith. We can explore this perverse refusal to see the causal connection between belief (in this instance a Muslim Jihadi's belief in Islam) and action by taking three cases where belief plays a central part in setting in motion certain human actions. It is generally accepted by those who study such questions that conscious thought precedes certain kinds of human action, while with others, like reflexes and the functioning of organs such as the heart, it does not. Obviously, it is the first kind that interests here. All conscious actions necessarily involve selection, or choices, whether we see it that way or not. Choosing to do something and then doing it must exclude, at that precise moment, the opportunity to do something else. This is in a way a sacrifice, a sacrifice of time and effort that could have been put to other uses, and we often think and speak of it in that way. Likewise, a given sum of money cannot effect, not at any rate legally and at the same time, two or more separate and competing purchases. As with time, it is one or the other, but not both simultaneously, what economists call 'opportunity cost'.

Now the three cases where we can observe this principle at work. Our first is a lover of classical music who, like most, prefers the works of some composers over all others, and acts on that preference by buying and spending time listening to certain CDs rather than others, and by spending time and money on attending certain concerts rather than others...a perfectly rational choice. We can say that he or she has 'sacrificed' a certain amount of money and time as a direct result of their preferences. Given knowledge of these choices, no reasonable person, without evidence to the contrary, would suspect our music lover of concealing preferences in music different from those implied by his or her actions, or claim that beneath these preferences, for which they are prepared to make sacrifices of their time and money, there lurked motives that had nothing at all to do with music, or even perhaps motives which our music lover was blissfully unaware of.

Next, we come to case two, one that shares something both with case one and case three; case one, because it also involves the sacrifice of time and money, and three, because the sacrifices involved, again of time and money, are not for a secular need, music, but religion. Who, again, without evidence to the contrary, would question the sincerity of the faiths of Christian churchgoers whose beliefs bring them to church most Sunday mornings, and whose idea of financial sacrifice to their religion consists mainly of putting a few coins or maybe a bank note in the collection box? We would say, on the strength of this evidence, that these churchgoers are, beyond reasonable doubt, a pretty average sort of Christian, and that their actions in this respect do not suggest any other conclusion.

However, when, in our case three, a well-educated and relatively prosperous young Muslim man (of course it could also be a woman) turns his back on his family, friends, education or job, finds his way by a devious and possibly dangerous route to Syria, and then gladly dies fighting those whom he believes and says are the enemies of his religion, his immeasurably greater sacrifices are interpreted in essentially secular terms; by the Sharia left (and not only the Sharia left) as being inspired by conventional political motives and factors (poverty, 'marginalisation', racism, imperialism, Zionism etc); by the Obamas, Clintons and Camerons as acts of nameless and aimless 'extremism' and by those agencies investigating them, as caused by 'mental health issues'. Yet if we turn to the history of Christianity, we have countless examples of men and women who were prepared to be burned alive for disputing the Church's interpretation of a passage or even single phrase in the Bible, and of others who were no less willing to burn them. No historian of the church would deny that whether as martyrs or inquisitors, Christians have been motivated by their faith to kill and be killed. So why not Muslims, especially when a series of surveys show that most Muslims are far more devout in their beliefs their Christian and Jewish counterparts, and what is even more to the point, prepared to act on them, again by both killing and being killed?

Let us next take two real life examples of our third case where it is simply impossible to believe that anything but a devotion to Islam was the sole motivation in recruitment to the Jihadi cause. In June 2015, three British Muslim sisters, minus their husbands but with their nine (sic) children, after making a pilgrimage to Mecca, fly to Turkey and then follow the well-beaten track across the border into Syria to join ISIS, where they will then, along, with their children, be obliged to live their lives...what remains of them...according to the rigors of Sharia law. As is usual in such 'disappearances', a chorus of Muslims voices could immediately be heard blaming the police for not preventing their departure from the UK, as if three adult married women with nine children should not be held responsible for their own actions. We can be sure that if the security agencies had placed them under surveillance, the same voices would have been heard complaining of 'profiling' and discriminatory policing. (In fact, this is exactly what two of their husbands claimed, blaming the departure of their wives on police harassment. You cannot win.) Then in July, twelve more Muslims from Luton made the same journey, only this time not via Mecca but Bangladesh. This entourage of prospective Jihadis spanned not two but three generations, the oldest being a grandfather aged 75, and the youngest a child aged one. Again, relatives claimed to be totally stunned by the news. Just like the families of assassins who gun down, behead and blow-up civilians at random in the name of Allah, a relative claimed their departures were 'completely out of character. This just does not make any sense. We can only assume they must have been tricked into going there'. A party of twelve that included nine adults was 'tricked' into going to Syria (presumably via Turkey) instead of flying home from Bangladesh to Luton? Was anyone really expected to believe this nonsense? As the amusing TV advert had it, should they have perhaps first gone to Specsavers before checking in on the wrong flight to what proved to be the Islamic State? After having the best part of four years to rectify their error, if, indeed error it was, there were reports in the western media that all 12 were dead, three killed fighting for the Islamic State (again, by mistake?), and most of the rest by western bombing raids. But there is a more plausible explanation. than short-sightedness. As the Koranic citations in Appendix L prove beyond any doubt, a Muslim's duty is to wage war

against the infidel, whatever the risks, whatever the cost. It is as simple as that. What more do such Muslims have to do to prove to sceptics that these and similar actions are driven by the imperatives of religious devotion? Why this irrational, stubborn refusal by politicians to accept the so obvious truth that tens of thousands of young men and women were willingly, gladly, killing and being killed for their faith? Historians of religion have recorded how in the distant past, men and women, for example the early Christian martyrs, behaved in exactly the same manner (except for the killing) and for the same reasons, and their motives were never questioned either then or subsequently. Indeed, many were rewarded for their ultimate sacrifice with sainthood. So why are the motives of their Muslim equivalents questioned today? Why the 'nothing to do with Islam' mantra, which invokes any number of reasons and motives other than the only one that accords with the facts?

Here we have a glaring and yet for many, unacknowledged inconsistency, in which the motives of those subscribing to secular ideologies and beliefs are seen in a totally different light to those who profess to act on their beliefs in the supernatural. No serious student of political behaviour would deny that white resistance to black civil rights in the southern states of the USA in the 1950s and 60s was motivated by racial prejudice, or that anti-Semitism was the prime cause of Nazi racial policies in the Third Reich. It is no less obvious that trade unionists man picket lines because they want a strike to be effective, that communists advocate and when in power, institute the socialisation of the means of production because, rightly or wrongly, they believe it is a more efficient and just economic system than capitalism, that large corporations fund conservative parties and pressure groups because they trust them to protect their interests more than any other organisation or party. All this and much more in the same vein we accept without question. But when Muslims commit acts of terror, or join terrorist movements, everything changes. Explanations are sought everywhere except where they belong, even when its zealots proclaim it, in some cases literally, at the tops of their voices...with the religion of peace.

In the world of politics, it is generally understood that debate and conflict between the various competing doctrines and parties takes place on the basis of what each advocates, while the voting public makes its choices according to its own inclinations as to the best option. And so long as the faith is not Islam, even religions are taken at their face value, at least when their results are seen as beneficial. The Rev. Martin Luther King's Christian beliefs are generally credited with being the main source of inspiration for his campaigns against segregation and for black civil rights and social justice. The same can be said of 19th century Quaker employers who treated their work forces far more decently than their rapacious, mainly non-conformist competitors. In the same way, Gandhi's strategy of non-violent resistance is attributed to his Jainist-influenced Hindu faith, and the Dalai Lama's to Buddhism. All this changes when it comes to evaluating actions motivated by a belief in Islam. We have come to expect that after every atrocity perpetrated by Muslims, apologists for Islam will argue that since by definition Islam is a religion of peace, love and tolerance, how could it motivate actions that are their exact opposites? If this is true, then the source must lie elsewhere. But where? Politicians never have to answer this so obvious question because those whose job it is to ask it never do. The Sharia left tells us that the source of Jihadism is, albeit in the guise of religion, the revolt of the Muslims masses against the depredations of western

imperialism and Zionism, even if those who wage it are not necessarily fully aware of it themselves. But even non-Sharia left atheists and more generally rationalists and secularists, are understandably so perplexed and even distressed by the idea of anyone wanting to kill and die for a belief so primitive and absurd as Islam, that they prefer to look elsewhere to explain such behaviour. It must be 'something else', though agreement on what that something is has so far proved elusive. To argue thus is to fall into the error of assuming that an illusion or a false idea cannot exert the same force of compulsion or inspiration on the human mind than a belief that is founded on reality. Yet just think of all the art works, music and monuments, many of them sublime, that from the dawn of human civilisation have been inspired by or dedicated to faiths and deities which the conflicting powers and truths claimed for each render all but one, at most, illusory...Bach's St Mathew Passion, Michelangelo's David, the temples at Luxor and Karnack, the Acropolis, the Mayan pyramids, the Golden Temple of Amritsar and the Great Mosque of Istanbul. Mundane secular life likewise furnishes numerous examples of the same phenomenon of acting in accordance with beliefs that are false, such as calling on a friend wrongly assumed to be at home. Up to the moment the caller finds they are mistaken, their actions would have been no different than if the assumption had been correct. I once was waiting at a bus stop, only to be told by a passer-by that the route did not operate on a Sunday. An entirely false assumption had guided my actions up to that point no differently than had it been correct.

Obviously, discovering that a certain assumption or belief has proved false can and usually does affect future behaviour. Next time, we can phone first to make sure our friend is in. I should have checked the bus timetables. With most people, this is one of the ways by which we learn to live in the world more effectively. As the saying goes, we learn from our mistakes. But the truly devout person cannot treat their faith in this rational, pragmatic way. Whatever their experiences in the real world, they cannot and generally do not allow themselves to think that they could be mistaken about the one thing that gives meaning and purpose to their lives. Their prayers can go unanswered, terrible things can happen to good people, and nice things to bad people, natural disasters can wipe out thousands of lives in seconds, good people die before their time, struck down by cancer and terrible hereditary diseases. But it changes nothing. Some, inexplicably, claim that personal tragedies make their faith even stronger. It is all part of god's plan, perhaps, as some theologians claim, a punishment or a test. As they, and even politicians remind us from time to time, 'god has a plan for each one us', one from which there is no escaping: 'The Lord of Hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand.' (Isaiah 14: 21) As it did for the millions of mainly devout Jews driven into gas chambers by the Nazis.

It is a source of puzzlement not only me but countless other non-believers why even today, millions of otherwise rational people devote countless hours of their lives to prayers asking their god to do this or that personal favour for them (for example, scoring from or saving penalties, possibly sometimes the same penalty) when their holy book (be it the Bible or the *Koran*) quite clearly tells them that not only their fate, but that of the entire universe, has, from the beginning of time, been set in celestial concrete. For those who seek an explanation as to why this is so, a Roman Catholic primer provides it: 'As for sufferings, persecutions, afflictions and misfortunes, these God not only permits, but Himself ordains for our good'. So like someone hooked on a conspiracy 'theory', into which every event is shoehorned to

prove it, the believer goes on believing that the almighty's purpose is manifested in every and anything that happens, whether good or what we see as bad. As the hymn has it, God moves in mysterious ways. When the religious can discern in all human misery and suffering, as they must, the working out of a divine and ultimately beneficent plan, we have to accept that such beliefs, however ill-founded and even absurd, are genuine, indeed, in the case of the world's 1.2 billion Roman Catholics, they are required to believe that the earthly institution that instils and upholds these beliefs is incapable of error. The *Catechism* assures the faithful that 'Christ endowed the Church's shepherds with the charism of infallibility in matters of faith and morals', what another Catholic text defines as the 'incapability [sic] of teaching what is false'. This assertion is simply a restatement of the principle first enunciated by Pope Saint Gregory VII (1073-85), described by the *New Advent Catholic Encyclopaedia* as 'one of greatest of all pontiffs and one of the most remarkable men of all times': 'The Roman church has never erred, nor can [not "will"] it err until the end of time'. This claim once required Catholics to believe, amongst other nonsenses, that that contrary to the proof provided by Galileo, 'God fixed the earth upon its foundation, never to be moved', and to that to argue otherwise was not only 'foolish, absurd and philosophically false' but 'formally heretical', an obligation that was only rescinded (thereby repudiating, if only by implication, Pope Gregory VII's dogma of Catholic inerrancy) in October 1992, when after more than three centuries of denial, Cardinal Poupard finally conceded that 'we today [sic!] know that Galileo was right in adopting the Copernican astronomical theory.' Again, I say, better late than never. That leaves only Islam still wedded to geocentrism, with the *Koran's* insistence that the sun 'is moving towards its determined goal' as it 'floats smoothly in an orbit' around the earth.' (36:41)

Because such religious beliefs are (like Sharia leftist anti-Zionism) impervious to factual evidence and rational criticism, when challenged by either argument or experience, they prove amazingly resilient, as the cases of Galileo and two centuries later, Darwin, have demonstrated. They therefore have the capacity to guide the actions of those who embrace them no less than beliefs that are founded on reason and proven facts. How else can we explain why thousands of young Muslims poured into Syria from Europe to kill and die for a cause that rests on no more evidence than does the *Koran's* belief in a flat earth? Sam Harris, the neurologist and atheist writer, put it very well:

The people who are devoting their lives to waging *Jihad* really believe what they say they believe. The psychological problem that secularists must overcome is the basic doubt that anyone believes in paradise. I've had anthropologists and other over-educated people look me in the eye and insist that *no one* believes in martyrdom and that even suicide bombers are really concerned about politics, economics, and male bonding. Some experts [sic] on terrorism sincerely believe that no one is ever motivated to act on the basis of religious ideas. I find this astonishing.

So do I. Historians of religion, irrespective of whether they themselves are believers or not, have no difficulty in accepting the obvious truth that until the dawn of the modern era, say beginning with the onset of the Enlightenment at the end of the seventeenth century, the entire population of our planet, save for possibly a handful of exceptions, believed in the existence of one or more supernatural powers that were responsible for the creation and behaviour of what modern science

understands as the universe, and, in particular, determined the fate of every single human being. There was of course always a secular component to the lives of those that lived in the pre-modern era...the world of work, family and pleasure. But even here, religious rites and rules loomed large. A historian of the early modern era puts it very well:

In our secular age it seems natural enough to concentrate on man's painful attempts to feed and clothe himself, and to organise society to minimize violence. Economics and politics are the fundamental issues; all else is top dressing. This order of priorities would not have been intelligible in the fifteenth century, or, indeed, three centuries later. Men may frequently have been lax in their religious duties, may sometimes have scoffed at the churches' doctrines or regarded the pretensions of priests with scepticism. Nevertheless, they were locked into a system of belief in the supernatural world by the brute facts of life; a hazardous, unpredictable world could only be understood in terms of the operation of possibly arbitrary spiritual forces. (C.S.L. Davies: *Peace, Print and Protestantism, 1450-1558*)

Recent palaeontological discoveries and research have proved beyond any doubt that for the last 100,000 years at the very least, the brain of *homo sapiens* has possessed the capacity to apply its powers of reasoning to tackle the problems that have confronted our species as its modes of existence have become ever more complex. But only in the last few centuries has this capacity been systematically applied, primarily in the form of science, and at that, not uniformly across the globe or in all cultures, and, least of all, in that created by Islam, a culture still totally in thrall to the claims of religious superstition in a manner resembling closely that described above. This so obvious truth is one that the western intelligentsia, its thinking blinkered by its own ideological inhibitions, seems incapable of comprehending, and its rejection results in a search for other explanations than the religious to account for why some Muslims behave the way they do. In the midst of this almost universal denial of the religious motivations that inspire Jihadism, any voice of sanity is welcome, no matter from what quarter.

It has in recent years become almost *de rigueur* for Christian clerics to speak well of a religion whose undisguised strategic objective is to put them out of business, a kind of turning of the theological cheek. Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams (who knows, possibly with the intention of easing the transition from a nominally Christian to an Islamising UK) even went so far as to advocate the incorporation of Sharia law into UK law. His successor, Justin Welby, fast-tracked into the job from a successful career in the world of mammon, although not going quite as far as his predecessor, conceded that Islam, with its *macho* warrior culture and inviting rewards for Jihadi martyrdom, was proving itself a far more, quote, 'exiting' option in the faith market than the less glamorous offerings of what he called 'mainstream religion'. Then, in March 2015, a lone, discordant voice disrupted the harmony of the Quisling clerical chorus. Incredibly, it was that of the Queen's Chaplain, the Reverend Gavin Ashenden. Unlike his fellow clerics and (and of course the UK's politicians), who find the message of Islam to be exclusively one of peace, love, toleration and compassion, the Reverend Ashenden had actually taken the trouble to read the *Koran* and, unlike the Pope, in doing so, found it contained more than one hundred passages that are 'inviting people to violence'. That's about right. (I cite 61 of these in Appendix L) It would not take long before the Reverend's readiness to speak the truth about the nature of Islam,

views totally at odds with both his own clerical establishment and those of his then employer's eldest son (see Appendix IX), would land him in royal hot water. In January 2017, instead of a reading from the Bible, a Muslim student (again) was invited to read a passage from the *Koran* at a service to mark the feast of Epiphany at Glasgow's St Mary Cathedral. The passage selected had been approved in advance by the event's organisers. Of all the passages that could have been chosen, the text selected and approved was one which *explicitly* denied the divinity of Jesus. Imagine, if you can, the reverse; a Christian being invited to read a passage from the Bible affirming the divinity of Christ in a mosque in Saudi Arabia at a service celebrating the beginning of Ramadan. With this very thought in mind, a justly outraged Ashenden wrote to *The Times*:

Sanctioning a key passage from *Koran* which denies the divinity of Jesus to be read in Christian worship has been criticised as a rather serious failure. The justification offered is that it engages some kind of reciprocity founders on the understandable refusal of Islamic communities to read passages from the Gospel in Muslim prayers announcing the Lordship of Christ. It never happens.

The Reverend Ashenden's letter was published on January 17. Less than a week later, the same paper announced that its author had resigned from his office as Chaplain to the Queen 'in order to be able to speak more freely about the struggle Christianity is facing in our culture'. Support from his fellow clergy for his defence of his - and their - faith was nowhere to be found. In an innovation that was certain, if not actually calculated, to delight the then *dhimmi* Prince of Wales, the former Bishop of Oxford, the ultra-'progressive' Lord Harries, proposed that at future coronations, there should be readings from ...yes, the *Koran*. I suggest a verse that runs thus: 'Those who believe from among the People of the Book [the Bible] and the Polytheists will be in hell-fire to dwell therein in for ever. They are the worst of creatures.' If this proposal is adopted, do not anticipate many Anglican eyebrows being raised at such an innovation. After all, none were when Yasser Arafat declared to a press conference in Geneva on September 2, 1983, that 'Jesus Christ was the first Palestinian militant *fedayeen* [a euphuism for terrorist] who carried his sword along the path on which the Palestinians today carry their cross [sic!]' . Certainly, no offence had been taken where it counted most, in Rome, because two weeks later, the cross-bearing Arafat was a guest of Pope John Paul II, observing that he felt at home in the Vatican, because it was the seat of St. Peter, 'the first Palestinian [sic] exile'. No wonder they say reality can be stranger than fiction...and in this case, I would add, more obscene.

Among those trying to sanitise Jihadism was self-appointed pundit Russell Brand, the Corbynista, Trumpista and Putinista multi-millionaire Jewish Christian convert and as I write, rape suspect, whose well-advertised pseudo-anarchist rantings accompanied his apologies for the anti-Semitic, genocidal theocratic thugs who ran the Gaza Strip like a mafia fiefdom. Numbering himself among the despised super-rich, he bragged that he evaded paying his train fare, while denouncing the 'system' and the corruption of his fellow plutocrats, from which he presumably was personally immune. However, his main claim to political fame was undermining the UK's liberal democracy by persuading young people not to vote - as if they needed any persuading. Brand also found the time to discover why young UK Muslims were turning to Jihadism. Like everything else about this self-

promoting political play-boy, it had all been said before. Jihadism springs, we were told, not from Islam, but is a reaction to the failings of British society: 'The kernel of the truth [sic] in the sprawling, bewildering bramble of ISIS madness is [presumably infidel] society isn't working, it's totally corrupt...that's the thing that resonates in the core of young people, that's the thing that pulls them into mad Jihadism.' So then, ISIS, for all its 'madness', possesses a 'kernel of truth', though exactly what it is, he doesn't say. Whatever it is, it 'resonates' with young Muslims (though he says young people) who, like Brand, have seen through the corruption of western liberal democracy, with its universal suffrage, free elections, higher livings standards, elected legislatures, rule of law, political parties, individual freedoms, free religion, and at least largely free speech and press, its trade unions, pressure groups, legally enforced gender equality, sexual freedoms, statutory paid holidays, free health care, free education, and of course television programmes featuring...Russell Brand. What is all this corruption worth, compared with what ISIS has to offer? Just like the rest of the Sharia left and Obama, Cameron and Clegg, Brand had nothing bad to say about Islam. If 'young people' are turning to terrorism, corrupt, materialist and increasingly godless infidels are the ones to blame. [For Brand's excursions into far right politics, see Appendix XIV.]

It is indeed true that many young Muslims do feel this way about the UK they have grown up in, though whether that is 'our fault' so speak, or due to their own religion's incompatibility with western civilisation, is another matter entirely. This is how one young UK Muslim saw it:

Stop putting freedom on this pedestal. This is a value stemming from secular liberal beliefs. We don't need a value which stems from a bankrupt ideology. We are becoming infatuated with the civilisation of the *kuffar* and their beliefs and their values...Now you know who you are...if you are one of those who state: "I will die to protect your freedom and believe in freedom of speech".

Evidently, we have here no disciple of Voltaire. But let us not rush to judgement. Could this not have been the angry outpourings of just the kind of alienated young Muslim that Brand had in mind: excluded, rejected, 'marginalised', victimised, stereotyped, stigmatised by racism and Islamophobia, and yet with the courage to reject and fight back against the iniquities and hypocrisy of white, corrupt, capitalist imperialist Britain? Well...not exactly. They were the on-line thoughts of one Aysl Choudhry, a 22-year-old Trainee Lawyer at the London law firm of Clifford Chance. He had nothing to say about what the Sharia left claims are the motivations that lie behind Islamic activism...the West's economic and social system, inequality, poverty, racism, imperialism, and the rest of it. What he hated about the UK and, by implication, the West generally, was its belief in freedom of speech, a freedom legally protected in UK courts even if nowhere else save Parliament, the very same hatred that led to the massacre of the *Charlie Hebdo* journalists only days before this item was posted on YouTube, and to which it was obviously a response. When his comments were drawn to the attention of his employers, their reaction made it very clear they saw no difficulties arising from their trainee's total rejection of all the principles underpinning the English legal and political system. In fact, they saw it as something to be, as the expression has it, embraced: 'The firm is committed to establishing an inclusive [sic] culture where people with diverse backgrounds and views [sic] work effectively together and feel confident to develop their potential.'

No matter that Choudhry's 'diverse views' diverged to the extent that they were in total opposition to those he was being trained and paid for to uphold, or that he was actively campaigning against them on the internet. One must assume his employers anticipated no difficulties arising from a situation where a Jewish woman could find herself defended in court by a barrister who regarded his client as a contemptible female 'kuffar', akin to an ape or a sow.

One would have thought that in the year of the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta, for his employers, it should have gone without saying that when it came to upholding the law, the one, single law of the land, there could be no room for cultural 'diversity', of two parallel, and even competing systems of law such as that proposed by Rowan Williams. One or the other has to prevail, and those charged with the responsibility of training recruits to the legal profession are betraying that trust if they think and teach otherwise. It is scandalous that a reputable law firm could boast of its welcoming attitude to such 'diversity', especially when, as in this case, it was totally at odds and at even at war with the hard-won and legally grounded liberal democratic culture of the UK. One wonders: what would the response of Clifford Chase be if, in a defence of the English legal system, one of their trainees had posted a trenchant critique of Sharia law? The infatuation with 'cultural inclusiveness' was not unique to Clifford Chance. In 2014, it led to no less a body than the Law Society proposing the adoption and application of Sharia law in cases involving only Muslims, including cases in which women would of necessity be treated as inferior to men. The proposal was only dropped after persistent and aggressive campaigning by secularists, not as a result of any objection from (Tory) government ministers.

To return to our main point: if, as Brand and those on the left claim, Jihadis are 'really' driven to commit terrorist acts, not by a fanatical devotion to their religion, but secular concerns, such as the evils of capitalist exploitation, racism and the like, why then do they not behead capitalist tycoons and Tory MPs instead of Syrian Christians and Yazidis, and cry out 'down with capitalism' or, in the Paris massacre at the office of *Charlie Hebdo*, 'death to racist journalists' instead of, as they do, 'God is Great' or 'the prophet is avenged'? Why were the targets in the 'copycat' Copenhagen killings of February 14, 2015 also, as in Paris, literary and Jewish, a cartoonist, and a synagogue instead of the rich and the powerful? Why desecrate 300 Jewish tombs and a Holocaust memorial in Alsace, as young Muslims did on the night of February 15, 2015? Did the self-proclaimed Jihadi Mohammed Mera strike a blow against capitalist exploitation and French imperialism when on March 19, 2012, he gunned down a rabbi and three Jewish children at a Jewish school in Toulouse, or Salman Abedi against British imperialism, as Corbyn implied, when he murdered 23 children at a pop concert in Manchester?

Are these targets and victims the defenders, bastions and symbols of western capitalism against which, so Brand and the Sharia left would have us believe, Islam is waging its *Jihad* on behalf of the exploited Muslim masses? Why not target instead the banks, the stock exchanges, the mansions and palaces of the ruling classes? When, in February 2015, ISIS beheaded on a Libyan beach 21 Coptic Christians, was this a blow struck against the crimes of western imperialism or, as the assassins themselves declared, collective retribution against the 'hostile Egyptian church'? How does the bulldozing, in March 2015, of the 3000-year-old Assyrian city of Nimrud by ISIS strike a blow against 21st century imperialism? Is it not just possible that ISIS, emulating here the precedent set by the Taliban,

destroyed such treasures for theological reasons, since they were the creations of a pre-Islamic pagan culture? I would like to see Brand and the SWP explaining how slaughtering 38 tourists on a beach in Tunisia, or more than a hundred young men and women at a gig in Paris, advances the struggle of the Arab masses for social justice, or, for that matter, the liberation of the Palestinians from 'Zionist oppression'.

But let us now conclude with two more examples our quest to understand what motivates Jihadi terrorism. and why some seem to find this task so far beyond their mental capacities. On September 21, 2013, masked gunmen burst into the Westgate shopping mall in Nairobi. It rapidly became obvious to those trapped in the complex that the purpose of the raid was not robbery, but mass murder, and that it had been targeted because its owner was an American Jew, David Siegal. It also became clear, despite the panic and mayhem, that not everyone was going to be killed. The gunmen set about interrogating shoppers, asking them a series of questions that only a Muslim could have known the answer to, such as the name of Mohammed's mother. Others were asked to recite Islamic prayers. Those who were able by their responses to prove themselves Muslims were told to leave the building. The gunmen then opened up with their automatic weapons on the infidels who remained. 67 were slaughtered, and 175 wounded, before the gunmen were themselves killed by Kenyan security forces. (Not, the reader will recall, the response favoured by Corbyn.) In what way had this atrocity struck a blow against western imperialism or, for that matter, Zionism? And in what sense was it not motivated by religion?

When three U.S. Muslims were charged in February 2015 with amongst other crimes, plotting the assassination of President Obama, it was revealed that one of the three, ibn Hasan, had stated on an Islamic website that he wanted to shoot Obama 'and then get shot ourselves'. Again, the death wish, the yearning for martyrdom, and the promise of the rewards of paradise...these desires are entirely religious. It is simply impossible to interpret them in any other way. The would-be assassins' motives had nothing whatsoever to do with those ascribed to Jihadis by Sharia left mind-readers or, for that matter, what their intended victim described as 'violent extremism'. As in every other case where we have access to the thoughts of Jihadis, whether in court, on line or in videos, the motive has been a an explicit, purely religious desire for martyrdom, 'for Allah', and against 'polytheists and infidels', not imperialism. It is, of course, possible to argue, like Russell Brand and his ilk, that when Muslims stone women to death for alleged sexual misdemeanours, hurl homosexuals from tall buildings, burn alive in cages fellow Muslims, bury alive, rape, behead and crucify Christians, kidnap and auction young women and girls for rape fodder, rear and train children to be assassins and suicide bombers and, generally, display in these and other actions their total rejection of the values of western civilisation, that this is indeed a kind of anti-imperialism, in as much as these values originated in, and are unfortunately still largely confined, to countries that the Sharia left defines as 'imperialist'. If there is indeed a cure, for want of a better word, for the wretchedness and waste of human life engendered by contemporary Islam, it is not by slavish adherence to the founding texts which are its cause, but by emancipation from them, to escape from the moral, mental and political prison of the mosque into the realm of the secular, just as increasing numbers of the world's other faiths have done, making possible advances in the quality of life that are the envy of an Islamic world still trapped a seventh century ghetto of its own making.

12 Abrogation

Today, murderous attacks on Jews are a routine event, not just in Israel, where they are first incited and then applauded by the Palestinian Authority no less than by Hamas and Islamic *Jihad*, but also in the infidel West. So it is important to place on record that when homicidal hatred of the Jews emerged as a prominent feature of Jihadi Islam, the Sharia left found it necessary to devise a justification for these movements' genocidal anti-Semitism. Writing in the *Socialist Worker*, in the time-honoured fashion of the anti-Semitic right, Paul Foot attributed the causes of Muslim anti-Semitism to the current behaviour of the Jews, and not the ancient founding texts of Islam: 'Especially pathetic on the part of our apologists for Israeli oppression is their bleating [sic] about anti-Semitism. For the sort of oppression [that is, of the Palestinians] they favour is the seed from which all racialisms, including anti-Semitism, grows.' One has to read this extraordinary, for a leftist, statement several times to confirm that it says what it says and means what it means. What Foot is indeed saying and we must assume meaning, is that 'racialism' in general, and anti-Semitism in particular, are products of, a response to 'oppression'. In other words, if Muslims hate and want to exterminate the Jews, it is the Jews who have brought it upon themselves by their 'oppression' of the Palestinians.

To buttress this argument, Foot, following the method of Einstein, first gives us a 'general' theory of 'all' racialism, and then extracts from it its 'special' application to the Jews, which is his only concern. But in doing so, he unavoidably, possibly unwittingly, provides not only a (false) explanation and justification for anti-Semitism, but for 'all' racisms, for example, that of the historic 'poor white' anti-black prejudice of the US's 'Bible Belt'. If we were to follow Foot's reasoning (remember he speaks of 'all racialisms') then it follows that the racism of the poor whites, with its lynchings and other abominable cruelties, was their presumably justified reaction to their oppression by even poorer blacks. Whatever its more general ramifications, certainly in the specific case cited, we are invited to accept the proposition, entirely belied by its Christian origins nearly two thousand years before the birth of Israel, that anti-Semitism is caused by Zionism, rather than, as the last hundred years has demonstrated, the reverse.

Although Foot was an experienced and highly respected journalist, in this instance he had evidently not bothered to follow the profession's normal procedure of consulting the relevant sacred Islamic sources before making this claim. Had he done so, he would have found that the true historical and theological 'seeds' of Islamic anti-Semitism were sown at the religion's birth, and are inscribed in its most holy texts, in the first place the *Koran*, and then in subsequent collections of *Hadith*, and therefore have nothing whatsoever to do with the contemporary politics of the Middle East. This was eloquently made clear by the eminent Egyptian cleric Muhammed Hussein Ya'qub: 'If the Jews left Palestine to us, would we start loving them? Of course not. The Jews are infidels not because I say so but because Allah does. They aren't our enemies because they occupy Palestine; they would be our enemies if they had not occupied anything.' What could be clearer? It is not a question of *where* the Jews are, but *who* they are. The root, or if you will, 'seed', of Islamic, and in this case, also Arab, anti-Semitism is not a response to Zionist oppression, but *theological*, a command of Allah himself. Islam's Jihadis do not

want to exterminate the Jews because of Israel; *they want to destroy Israel because it is Jewish*. How else explain that in the thirty years of the British Mandate in Palestine, Muslim terror was directed, not against the British occupier, but the Jews. Foot's lamentable excursion into the realms of race theory was but one, very sordid, aspect of the Sharia left's accommodation with its Islamic allies. But it was also more than this. In searching for, and finding, a 'theoretical' justification for Islamic anti-Semitism, Foot simply gave a 'leftist' slant to the very same arguments advanced by those who, since the end of the 19th century, have claimed to have unravelled the secrets of a 'world Jewish conspiracy'. Starting with the original Russian Orthodox clerical exponents of the *Protocols* myth, then recycled by the Nazis and today, taken up by the Sharia left's anti-Zionist heroes, Hamas and Hezbollah, hatred of and even the total extermination of the Jews is presented as the necessary and legitimate response to their cunningly-masked domination of the world. Just as Foot says, (and not he alone) the Jews have brought it on themselves.

Together with justifying their anti-Semitism, the Sharia left attributes to Jihadist movements a social and economic radicalism they do not possess and, what is more, do not claim to possess. This was exemplified in spectacular fashion by an article on the Nigerian Islamic State affiliate Boko Haram in the Socialist Workers Party *Bulletin* of August 12, 2014, just at the time when the Jihadist movement was getting into its stride, destroying schools, kidnapping and forcible converting their Christian girl pupils and marrying, and in some cases, auctioning them off as concubines and wives to its militiamen. Its main concern was to warn against the dangers of Nigeria's accepting outside military assistance to combat Boko Haram, which, on balance was deemed to be somehow progressive, on the basis of the principle that the enemy of my enemy - 'western imperialism' is my friend. Hence the opposition to a possible 'deployment in Nigeria of military personnel from the US and Britain', just as the SWP opposed, again on the same basis, western military aid for Ukraine following its invasion by Russia in 2022, for the Kurds in their resistance to the Islamic State and, again together with Corbyn, to western support back in the 1990s for the Muslims of Bosnia and Kosovo in their resistance to Serbian 'ethnic cleansing', which the Socialist Workers Party preferred to describe as 'border rectifications'- like Putin's in Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia.

Then, the 'friend' was the subsequently indicted war criminal Slobodan Milosevic and his marauding gangs of rapists and murderers, while the 'enemy' was as always, the 'western imperialists', protecting (belatedly) the Muslims of Bosnia and Kosovo. Hard as it is to believe, with the Sharia left now acting as cheer leaders for Jihadi Islam, the SWP was then denouncing genuine Muslim freedom fighters, whom it derisively called 'Mujahidin auxiliaries', for accepting western support against Serb 'ethnic (in reality, religious) cleansers' and rapists, proving that for the far left, Islam was simply a club, one amongst several, to beat the West with. This is the only possible explanation for why in 2004, the normally Islamophile Corbyn signed an Early Day motion in the House of Common, the purport of which was to reduce by a factor of six the extent of atrocities committed by Russian-backed Serbian forces on Muslims in Kosovo. Three years previously, *Guardian* journalist Seumas Milne, whom Corbyn appointed as his 'spin doctor' after his election as Labour Leader in 2015, penned an article claiming that Milosevic, indicted by The Hague Tribunal on 66 counts involving genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity, was the victim of a 'brazenly political' trial. And, some say, like Palestine

Solidarity Campaign activist, Jewish conspiracy theorist, Holocaust denier, Nazi sympathiser and twice photo op partner of Corbyn, Tony Gratrex, so were the defendants at the Nuremberg Trials. Another Corbynista, Labour MP for Halifax, Alice Mahon, appeared as a character [sic] witness for Milosevic. After her death in December 2022, Corbyn described her as someone who 'loathed injustice in any form'...save that is, the genocide of Balkan Muslims.

Just like the Palestinians who fell afoul of their Arab brothers in Syria, and the Kurds fighting the Islamic State, the Muslims of Kosovo and Bosnia were the wrong sort of Muslims. Depending on the alignments of global and regional politics, more recently, other Muslims have again found themselves on the wrong side of history, like the 600,000 Rohingya Muslims pogromed and driven into Bangladesh by the Burmese military, without a word of protest, let alone a demonstration outside the London Burmese embassy, by the Stop the War Coalition? Why the silence? Could it have been because Washington had accused the Burmese military of ethnically cleansing its Muslims? Contrast this with the pro-Hamas rallies outside the Israeli embassy addressed by Corbyn during the Gaza conflicts of 2014, 2021 and 2013-14. Why no similar protests at China's mass internment of its Xingjian Muslims? Like Palestinians in Syria and victims of black on black murder in the USA, some Muslims can be less equal than others.

In the light of these purely opportunist alignments, it should be obvious that for all the Sharia left plaudits for 'militant Islamism', the overriding criterion in each given situation is whether Jihadist movements, irrespective of their domestic political and social agendas, can be considered allies in the struggle against western liberal democracy. If this criteria is met, and as result, requires down-playing or ignoring the reactionary nature of such movements, and instead presenting their objectives and actions as an expression of something positive, even emancipatory, then so be it. This was the tactic notoriously followed by Corbyn in the promotion of his 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah, allegedly seeking 'dialogue' and striving for 'social justice' and 'long-term peace', just as the SWP's Boko Haram, was a movement 'fuelled by abject poverty, rampant unemployment and disillusionment'. Let us grant, for the sake of the argument, that these play a part in Boko Haram's growth. But so they did during the depression with the rise of the Nazi Party in Germany and the Ku Klux Klan in the USA. and more recently, the hi-jacking of the Republican Party by Trump. Therefore, we should also ask...what of Boko Haram's religious fanaticism, which determines its political character and direction, and drives it to commit horrendous atrocities, not only against Christians but fellow Muslims, that have nothing to do with curing Nigeria's many social ills? We are given the answer: 'Militant Islamism cannot be generally [n.b.] described as "reactionary"'. This formulation allows for the possibility, as in the Balkans in the 1990s, when it found itself temporarily aligned with the West, that it can be. But not in Afghanistan, Iran, Africa, the Middle East, or the western Muslim diaspora.

The basis of the far left and its front organisations for their assessment of and dealings with Jihadist movements and regimes, and their counterparts in the diaspora, is therefore determined solely by their attitude towards the West in general and Israel in particular.. If 'reactionary' implies pro-western, and given the context, it does, then to be anti-western is to be 'progressive'. And if it means what it says, the dictum must apply, and in fact does, not only to Hamas and Hezbollah, but also al-Qaeda, the Taliban, the Islamic State and its associated movements such as Boko Haram and al Shabaab. Even after al Shabaab's

slaughtering of 142 non-Muslim students at Kenya's Garissa University in April 2015 (again, Muslim students were spared after proving their religious identity) the SWP's on line *Socialist Worker* of April 7 felt compelled to observe that 'some [who, precisely?]' see it as an alternative to the corruption and greed of Kenya's western-backed ruling class.' There we have the key... 'western-backed'. Because elsewhere in the same issue, in an article titled *The Roots of Al Shabaab*, the terrorist movement is portrayed, warts and all, as an anti-imperialist force. With an air of triumph, we are told that 'frequently commentators have announced Al Shabaab to have been finally routed by African Union AMISON "peace-keeping" forces and US military strikes, only to see the group bounce back [sic] and launch attacks [i.e., massacres] inside Somalia and across the border into Kenya'. Bravo, Al Shabaab! Keep the (non-Muslim) body count rolling.

By a process of deductive reasoning, the SWP arrived at the conclusion that since such movements are not in essence 'reactionary', they must in some way be 'progressive' and therefore, by dint of their resistance to 'western imperialism', worthy of support, however qualified or critical. As the negative aspects, such as they are, of 'militant Islamism' do not detract significantly from this role, it should therefore be treated an ally in the struggle. This strategy needed to be explained to the hundreds, by now probably thousands, of abducted Christian school girls auctioned off to Boko Haram militia men as sex slaves, and to the teachers and pupils of schools burned to the ground in Boko Haram's war against 'western education' (Boko Haram means 'western education is forbidden'). For nowhere in the article is there a condemnation of their consequences to education-starved Nigerian children. Instead, we are given what amounts to a justification: 'When so many secondary and university graduates are unemployed, is it any wonder that Boko Haram supporters question the value of "western" education?' While conceding that Boko Haram has a 'contradictory nature', (where would the Sharia left be without the 'dialectic?') the emphasis was on its positive features, its 'anti-establishment demands', which 'find resonances in the hearts of many poor and dispossessed people'...just as Hitler's did, or those of the KKK and Trump.

We are told that Boko Haram, when it was not looting, killing, using children as suicide bombers (one as young as seven), burning, raping and kidnapping, was hard at work, like its ISIS brothers-in-arms, constructing its own theocratic welfare state: 'Boko Haram has provided Koranic education [a text book example of oxymoron], housing, health care and offsetting of debts'. Who needs secular 'western education' when children can have the flat earth and geo-centric 'Koranic' (sic!) version? The price for this 'education' was that of October 2015, 17,000 mainly Muslim Nigerians had been killed by Boko Haram, more than a hundred children used as suicide bombers, thousands of girls abducted, auctioned and sold as sex slaves, and over two million driven from their homes. Yet the article ended with a series of slogans, directed not against Boko Haram, but any forces which were being or might in future be deployed to combat it. In its rampage through the Muslim north, Boko Haram was to be given a free run: 'The [Nigerian] army is also killing. Troops back to barracks Poverty is the real enemy. US troops out of Nigeria'. All that was lacking was: 'We are all Boko Haram'. Whoever penned this must have known that there were no US troops in Nigeria. In fact the Obama administration devised an excuse not to send any, namely Nigeria's less than tolerant attitude towards gays, though the Saudi Kingdom's public beheading of homosexuals had never proved an obstacle to Washington's generous supply of military hardware to Saudi Arabia.

The SWP's stance on Boko Haram was consistent with its response to the Al-Qaeda suicide attacks of September 11, 2001, in which 2,977 died: 2,753 office workers at the World Trade Centre, 365 airline passengers, 343 fire-fighters and 71 law-enforcement officers. In the wake of this slaughter, the SWP adopted as party policy a document which declared that 'Islam [not 'Islamism'] can be a motivating force for the masses to fight back against imperialism and poverty'. That is exactly the role that Boko Haram had subsequently supposedly fulfilled in Nigeria, the Taliban in Afghanistan and Pakistan, Al Qaeda in the Middle East, North Africa and New York, Hamas and Islamic *Jihad* in Gaza, Fatah in the West Bank, Hezbollah in Lebanon, ISIS in Iraq and Syria, and its offshoots and proxies in Africa. Somehow, not just the SWP and Corbyn, but nearly the entire far left, had managed to convince itself that these movements could serve as partners in the struggle for a socialist future. Yet all the evidence pointed to the conclusion that the Paris and Copenhagen assassins, the UK-born Jihadis fighting for ISIS in Syria, and the militias of Boko Haram and the Taliban waging their war against 'western education' would have found find it both insulting and ludicrous in the extreme the proposition that they were killing and dying for a cause so profane, so contemptibly 'western', 'materialist' and secular as, for example, opposition to Euro-zone austerity, bankers' bonuses, or longer waiting times for National Health Service operations.

It is so obvious; it is embarrassing to have to repeat it so many times. If we listened to what they and their religion actually say, instead of either praising them as anti-imperialists, as does the far left, or condemning them for acts of mindless and motiveless terror, as do mainstream politicians, we would be obliged to accept, because all the evidence tells us it is so, that they are actually killing and dying for a sacred cause, for Allah. It is high time it was understood that unlike most young people in the west, religion is for millions of young Muslims a literally deadly serious business, all-pervading and all-consuming, and that its sacred texts promise to its martyrs rewards that no earthly life can compete with. This the Muslim suicide bomber really does believe, because his holy book tells him so. 'They that fight in the cause of Allah, and they slay and are slain' are told to 'rejoice then in your bargain which you have made with Him, and that is the mighty triumph.' (*Koran*, Chapter 9, Verse 11)

In the largely and, save for the intrusions of Islam, increasingly secular west, many, perhaps most, find it impossible to credit that in these times such thoughts can continue to guide human behaviour. It has to be 'something else' that drives the Jihadis to behave the way they do. Whatever it is, it can't be religion, especially not Islam, which is, so we are assured, all about peace, compassion, kindness, tolerance and love, etc. There is a glaring inconsistency in such arguments because, without it being explained why, they are not applied to those of other faiths than Islam. Roman Catholics who display homophobic prejudices towards gays, oppose female clergy and the use of condoms to prevent AIDS, and who even murder staff working at abortion clinics, are not depicted by the left as proletarian class warriors or, for that matter, hirelings of imperialism and big business, but as what they are...bigots, religious fanatics. Not only on the left, but more generally, it is agreed that such attitudes are derived from papal teachings, and are not 'really' about some other, totally unrelated secular issue.

When Roman Catholic clergy commit child rape but evade prosecution, the blame is (rightly) laid at the door of the Vatican, which has used all manner of tactics to protect them, even though the sexual abuse of children is no part of Christian teaching. However, the sexual abuse of children by child marriage *is* sanctioned by Islam, and practised on a truly vast scale, sometimes with fatal consequences for the bride. But unlike Catholic clergy paedophilia, it escapes not only condemnation in the infidel west, but also prosecution. For those who place a premium on 'inclusion', 'diversity' and 'community cohesion', as we have seen with the scandal of the Muslim gang rape industry, prosecuting the sexual abuse of diaspora Muslim children presents all manner of difficulties. In the first place, we have the example of the prophet himself, a role model for all Muslim men, whom, Islamic tradition has it, married his last wife Aisha when she was aged six and Mohammed 50, and first had sexual intercourse with her when she reached the age of nine. If the prophet were today to return to earth on his winged charger, inadvertently land in the UK, and resume his accustomed sexual practices, providing the law was allowed to take its course, he would have his name entered the sex offenders register as a convicted paedophile and be locked up, possibly for life, in a nonce's wing at one of Her Majesty's prisons.

Following the impeccable example of Islam's founder, child brides, often sold off to aging men by poverty-stricken families, thus became and still remains a norm in the poorest and most primitive parts of the Islamic world. Then there is the disgusting practice of 'thighing', in which, again following the example of the prophet, an adult male is allowed to rub his penis between the thighs of a child, even of a baby. In a recent ruling on this practise by a committee of Islamic scholars, *fatwa* 31409 held that when his bride to be Aisha was aged six, Mohammed 'placed his penis between her thighs and massaged [sic] it lightly, as the apostle of Allah had control of his penis not like other believers.' With some Muslim men ever-eager to emulate the prophet when it gratifies their sexual appetites, this form of child abuse is widely practised throughout the Middle East and, so it is claimed, here in the UK, especially at social functions. And, believe it or not, as we shall see, even necrophilia and bestiality are sanctioned by some schools of Islamic law, because authentic sources exist to prove it. (See Appendix G) Yet if one were to attribute these and other sexual practises to the teachings and traditions of Islam, citing in each case an approved Islamic text, the chances are, one would be accused of Islamophobia and however illogically, of racism, and quite possibly risk prosecution under 'hate speech' laws.

Finally, we have the most obvious inconsistency of all. Self-appointed authorities on Islamic terrorism, who claim that they know better than the terrorist what he really believes in, would take great umbrage if they themselves were told that there were others who knew better than themselves what they believed in, and were thinking at any one time. They would rightly reply that no one can know for certain what one is thinking save the person who is doing the thinking...unless of course the thoughts are those of Muslims gunning down journalists in a Paris editorial office and Jews in a Kosher supermarket, or flying planes into a skyscraper.

The following official UK Home Office statistics help us to throw light on the causal relationship between belief in Islam and terrorism. In the period between September 2001 and March 2012, of the 220 persons convicted of terrorist offences in the UK, 175 were known to be Muslims. It is reasonable to assume that at least some of the remaining 45 were also Muslims but let us stay with the 175 who were

known for sure to be so. Thus, at a minimum, 79% of all those convicted were known Muslims. Since Muslims in 2015 constituted 4.8 % of the UK population, they were, at the very least, 80 times more likely to be convicted of terrorist offences than the UK's 95.2% non-Muslims. In the year ending April 2015, the number of arrests connected with alleged terrorist offences reached a record 338, 11% of whom were females, and 17% under the age of 20. It is safe to assume that Muslims, as previously, comprised a substantial majority of those arrested. Given that the reason why Muslims dominate these statistics is so patently obvious, one has to again admire the sheer *chutzpah* of those who refuse to admit that it is religion, pure and simple, which drives Muslims to commit acts of terrorism, regardless of the consequences not only to their victims, but to themselves. (For a comprehensive survey and analysis of Muslims convicted in UK courts of terrorist-related offenses between 1998 and 2015, I recommend the study published on-line by the Henry Jackson Society in 2017.)

While some Muslim clerics, mainly in the west, falsely deny there is any specific textual justification for terrorism (See Appendix L for numerous examples that there is) they are nevertheless also obliged to uphold the claim that the *Koran*, being the word of Allah and not the work of mere mortals, is not limited or dependent in any way by when and where it was given, or to whom. It is perfect, unchanging and unchangeable, unbounded by any 'context'; that is, place and time. It cannot therefore be subjected to any revision or 'updating'. It is eternal and universal. And, most crucially of all, as the unadulterated word of Allah, it cannot be questioned let alone criticised, and there are very few Islamic scholars or clerics who, even if they thought it should be, would dare to say otherwise. It therefore follows that Islamic clerics are obliged to proudly claim that unlike other faiths, Islam does not permit of 'cherry picking'. It is a case of all or nothing. But when gullible or cynical non-believers do so on its behalf, selecting excerpts that hopefully throw a softer light on what is in word and deed a brutal, barbaric, creed, they raise no objections. And this division of labour has indeed worked very well, sustaining for the uninformed infidel who, in such matters, is more likely to heed infidel politicians rather than clergy of an alien faith, the lie that Islam is indeed a religion of peace. In this respect, it is surely of some significance that no politician or anti-Zionist leftist has ever cited the texts quoted in this work, but only those few which, quite falsely, especially when redacted *a la* Clegg, convey a kinder picture of the faith. Islamic clerics must realise better than anyone else what kind of deception is being practised here. But, just for once, they say nothing

They know, but wisely never point it out, that the selection of these particular verses violates a fundamental axiom of Islamic theology, because they are rendered invalid by the Koranic principle and system of 'abrogation', in Arabic, *Nasikh wal-Mansoukl*. According to the principle of abrogation, a later pronouncement in the *Koran*, if in conflict with one given earlier, renders the earlier one invalid. (Yes, even Allah, sometimes gets it wrong, and then changes his mind) The *Koran* says exactly this, in Chapter 2, Verse 107: 'Whatever message we abrogate or cause to be forgotten [sic], we bring one better than that or the like thereof. Knowest though not that Allah has the power to do all that He wills?' - including the ability to contradict himself without contradicting himself, and improve on perfection. Since the author of the *Koran* gave no obvious indication of which verses were to be 'abrogated', and which verses had supplanted them, out of the original discipline of Koranic exegesis there evolved the supplementary skill known as '*ilmu 'n-nasikh*

wa 'l-mansukh, by which scholars reconciled the circle of Allah's infallibility with the square of his having to correct himself.

By arranging the presumed dates of the creation of the *Koran's* chapters chronologically (that is not how they appear in its text), it was determined that the verses which today are cited to depict Islam as religion of peace originated from the initial Mecca period, when Mohammed and his small band of followers, massively outnumbered, unarmed and scorned, were unable to force their beliefs on anyone else. Understandably then, in these verses, there is no talk of *Jihad*, but there is of peace with and toleration of...Muslims. This period of Koranic dictation therefore supplies the quotations politicians and the politically correct so desperately need, the favourite being Chapter 2, Verse 256's 'there is no compulsion in religion'. However, with the move to Medina, the prophet and his band of followers soon acquire sufficient military force for Islam to become first, the dominant, and then, the city's only religion. Mohammed then returns to Mecca, as its conqueror and ruler. Now the message from Allah ran: 'I will cast terror into the hearts of the disbelievers.' This comes in Chapter 8, appropriately named *Anfal*, the Spoils, Verse 13. Not peace but *Jihad* becomes the order of the day and with it, the expansion of the rule of Islam by conquest, and the elimination of all opposition, religious, military and political.

Those parts of the *Koran* which are said to date from Medina and the triumphant return to Mecca reflect this change from tolerance (of Muslims) to domination (by Muslims), and thus, according to the principle of abrogation, render invalid earlier verses that they contradict. Seen in this way, Islam does indeed permit a kind of 'cherry picking', the difference being that Allah does the picking, with the result that, unlike the system applied to the Bible, it results in the 'nasty' passages unavoidably being preferred to the 'nice' ones. Today, Muslims are confronted with a choice, upon which depends the future of their faith and with it, the societies it governs and in turn, to a degree, those it does not. Either the (abrogated) *Koran* is the whole, eternal, perfect truth, and its commands, including the summons to *Jihad*, therefore always have to be obeyed without question as dictated and written, or, as we have seen with 'reform' Muslims, some of its verses were relevant only to the place and time they were given, and therefore can now be safely ignored. (See Chapter 8) One or the other. There are no indications as yet that the latter school is making any headway in this admittedly perilous undertaking, partly at least because the western powers that be, instead of encouraging the reformers, for geopolitical as well as domestic reasons, prefer to deal with the big battalions of Islamic orthodoxy.

Aside from the apologetics and contortions of the theologians, the shameful reality is that despite the textual evidence, which is available to all, and the atrocious crimes committed by those who obey its commands, with the honourable exception of Czech President Milos Zeman (See Appendix 6), no mainstream politician, anywhere, has had the courage to speak the simple truth that as it stands, Islam is a religion of war, a war waged to establish a world-wide theocratic tyranny that would spell the doom of western civilisation, and that the sooner its clergy did what Lord Pearson proposed by 'abrogating' this objective, the better it would be for all concerned, not least those Muslims who are called upon to do the killing and the dying. The hope that an as yet marginalised and persecuted 'moderate' Islam will, somehow, prevail over the current version remains, as yet, just that, a hope. Faced with the challenge of the Islamic *Jihad* to western civilisation, we should

never forget a similar time when world statesmen and party leaders, on the left as well as the right, assured us, again in defiance of all the evidence, not least of his *Li Jihad*, being the Arabic for *Mein Kampf*, or My Struggle, that Hitler also was 'a man of peace'. (See Appendix VIII) And yet two of the world's most powerful leaders, President Obama, with his deluded quest for an Islam of peace, and Chancellor Merkel, who politically destabilised an entire continent by illegally opening its doors to an unprecedented, uncontrolled, unlimited and illegal stream of Muslim migrants (as distinct from genuine refugees), seemed to be afflicted with the same myopia that in the 1930s brought western civilisation to the brink of collective suicide.

Addendum

The *dhimmi* Left is not alone in according to what it calls 'militant Islamism' a progressive role in human affairs. First, multi-cultural 'diversity' and 'inclusion';

'...there is the scaremongering concerning Sharia Law. This is regarded by the anti-Islamic crusader as barbaric, involving torture and humiliation unto which no Christian should succumb...[But} different faiths have different needs. What a dull, grey world it would be if everything in our society were to be standardised and subject to a one-size-fits-all rule on matters of a law and regulation. Yes, we have diversity [sic] and there should never be coercion to conform to a single way of living. I say [just like Archbishop Rowan Williams the law Society and the SWP] that Muslims are entitled to another tier of law if their faith demands it.

Next, economic policy:

'Muslims...believe in a system which is opposed to the system in what we call 'the West'. By opposing that system, Muslims offer a way out of the debt slavery culture we all seem to accept as the norm...In this centralised *kafir* system, we are all controlled by police states, surveillance everywhere with large corporations imposing a commercial ethic that becomes institutionalised...Muslim economics is the direct opposite of the system under which we languish in 'the West' because its central theme is one of giving and not debt creation. It is the voluntary sharing of wealth by the rich and the poor. [how then are the rich still rich and the poor, poor?] ...It was practised in Libya under [sic] Colonel Gaddafi...before he was toppled and murdered, the Central Bank of Libya was independent of the Rothschild model [sic] of global banking...This voluntary giving in place of debt is one of the greatest achievements of the Islamic faith and one that offers an alternative to the present system in 'the West'.

Now Israel:

'The Israeli flag which features at these [football] games is both a religious and racist symbol that could offend many people with sympathies for the plight of the Palestinians and, as such, should be banned at football matches. It is the symbol of the murderous oppression on innocent people in Gaza at this very moment in time...The state of Israel is exclusive and racist in the sense that it a Jewish state for a Jewish people, despite a token Arab representation. [the Arab Joint List is the third largest party in the Knesset.] The Arabs are second class citizens [another lie]

in Israel with no property rights [and another]. The Israelis...seem to be allowed to practice *apartheid* in the region with the West simply looking on.'

I could go on, but the reader will surely have grasped the general drift of the author, which, in several respects, overlaps or coincides with the Sharia left's. He is Robert Edwards, advocate of the Strasserite brand of National Socialism, so named after the Strasser brothers Otto and Gregor, who headed the plebian wing of the German Nazi Party in the early 1930s. In addition to comments on contemporary politics, as above, his website also features material dating from the pre-war British Union of Fascists of Sir Oswald Mosley.

13 Who's Left?

Perhaps the most dramatic indicator and consequence of the West's denial of and retreat before the Islamic offensive is that its high-profile critics and opponents, following a series of assassinations, merely to stay alive now require 24-hour armed police protection, live in secret, secure accommodation, wear bullet proof vests and, in two cases at least, both in Holland, have had to travel only in armoured cars. The response of politicians of all persuasions has been to place the blame for these unprecedented security measures on those bold enough to speak out against the Islamic threat to the West's freedoms, not on those who threaten them. The message is clear: 'If only they would keep their thoughts to themselves, none of this would be necessary.' In the same spirit, and as if echoing Paul Foot, the Social Democratic Mayor of Malmo, Sweden, after a series of violent assaults by Muslims on Jews in his city, gave this warning to the victims: 'Jews have themselves to blame as long as they do not distance themselves from Israel's abuse of Palestinians.' Like the victims of 9/11. and of an ever-growing number of other Jihadi atrocities, 'they have it coming.'

One cannot avoid the conclusion that not only anti-Zionism but naked electoral opportunism played its part in eliciting this shameful and cowardly comment, since one third of Malmo's population is Muslim, dwarfing the increasingly besieged and now rapidly shrinking number of Jews. The argument has become a familiar one. Unless they exercise *dhimmi* self-censorship, writers, artists and film makers will be also 'asking for it', like the Japanese translator of Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*, the staff of *Charlie Hebdo* and Theo van Gogh, the maker of the film 'Submission' (in Arabic, 'Islam') on the forbidden topic of the subjugation of women by Islam. In conformity with Sharia blasphemy laws, images of Mohammed are either blacked out or pixelated on TV screens even when they are the subject of the news item in question. Nothing must be said or shown which can possibly give 'offence' to the Religion of Peace, least its peaceful devotees run amok, or, as an oxymoronic poster on a Muslim demonstration threatened, 'behead those who say Islam is violent'.

There was a time when the far left would have refused to be party to such cowardly practises. Now it leads the pack in the war on a phantom Islamophobia. Long gone are the days when it unanimously rallied to the defence of Salman Rushdie, forced to go into hiding from a death sentence for writing a novel supposedly 'offensive' to Islam. Instead, in what must be one of the most spectacular of all retrospective policy reversals, nearly two decades later, the SWP cried *mea culpa*, since it had belatedly come to the conclusion, no doubt with the literary sensitivities of its Islamic allies very much in mind, that the seeds of 'Islamophobia' were sown by the campaign in defence of Rushdie, who was then, as irony would have it, closely associated with the very same SWP which played a commendably prominent role in his defence. Now that error of judgment had to be corrected. Writing in the *Socialist Worker* of February 11, 2006, Alex Callinicos spelt out the new line: 'The Rushdie Affair marked the beginning of a campaign [actively supported by comrade Callinicos's party] by many western liberals to portray Islam as a uniquely dark, barbaric religion.' (Where did that absurd notion come from?) Thus the political ground was prepared for the scurrilous attack by the SWP on the

staff of *Charlie Hebdo* after their murder by Jihadi assassins. That same year, 2006, the SWP proved its eagerness to make amends for its earlier error in the best possible way, demonstrating its opposition to what Lindsey German would call the 'shibboleth' of press freedom by officially participating in a Trafalgar Square rally called by the Muslim Association of Britain, which has the UK franchise for the Muslim Brotherhood, to protest against the Danish cartoons of Mohammed. Jeremy Corbyn captured the mood and the purpose of the rally perfectly when he demanded that 'respect' be shown for all religions, code for the suppression of criticism of Islam. In the light of the SWP's participation in a rally whose purpose was to secure legal means to silence satire of Islam, let us remind those on the left, who were to later enforce these restrictions on university campuses, of what some of their mentors had to say on the subject of freedom of expression. Karl Marx: 'The free press is the ubiquitous vigilant eye of a people's soul'. Rosa Luxembourg: 'Freedom is always for the one who thinks differently'. Leon Trotsky: '... any working class "leader" who arms the bourgeois state with special means for controlling public opinion in general and the press in particular is, precisely, a traitor... Anyone who has not understood this should get out of the ranks of the working class'. And as a bonus, the leftist heretic, George Orwell: 'Freedom is the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.'

Already in the UK, there had been created a battery of laws that restrict what could be said in public about certain subjects. Just how far some on the left were prepared to go down what Trotsky called this 'suicidal' path was exemplified by David Jamieson, a spokesman for the 'International Socialism Group'. Jamieson, who described himself as a 'politics graduate', endorsed, if belatedly, the initial establishment response to the Rushdie *fatwah* with the time-worn cliché that the author 'knew what he was doing' and therefore got what he deserved, adding for good measure that the novel was a 'semi-literate anti-Muslim polemic'. Since when has there been something inherently wrong about works of literature that adopt a critical stance towards religion... for example, classics like Voltaire's *Candide* or Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*? Or is only Islam off limits? But he went further, adding that if another burning of *The Satanic Verses* were again in prospect, he would 'pass the matches'. Surely someone as politically well-informed as Jamieson would have known that a friend of Karl Marx no less, the German Jewish lyric poet, Heinrich Heine, exiled for his radical views on religion and politics, and his works, like Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*, banned in his homeland, had predicted nearly two centuries ago that just as in the time of the *auto da fe* of the Spanish Inquisition, there could again come a day when 'they first burn books' and 'end by burning human beings'. And, sure enough, a century on would see Nazis begin by first burning books deemed 'un-German' by the thousand, including those by our three Jewish advocates of press freedom, and end by first gassing and then burning the corpses of Jewish human beings, or 'apes and swine' as the *Koran* would have it, by the million. Then, in 1989, came the burnings by Muslims of a novel deemed un-Islamic, followed, on September 11, 2001, by the burning alive of New York office workers in fires ignited by Muslim suicide pilots. Finally, in January 2015 the world was witness to the videoed burning alive in a cage of the Jordanian fighter pilot held hostage by the ISIS Caliphate. A month later, 45 Iraqi Muslims (the wrong kind) were burned alive by ISIS after its capture of the city of al-Baghdadi.

Despite its subsequent condemnation by Muslim leaders, burning alive is sanctioned by the *Koran*: 'Those who disbelieve in our signs, We shall cause them

to enter Our fire. As often as their skins are burnt up. We shall give them in exchange other skins that they may continue to taste the punishment. Surely Allah is Mighty and Wise.' (Chapter 4, Verse 57) There is a revealing sequel which tells us much about the duplicity of so-called 'moderate' Islam, whose representatives, such as the Emir of Qatar, were always made welcome by Obama in the Oval Office. On February 4, 2015, that is, shortly after the burning alive of the Jordanian pilot, the Qatar government removed from its official website, without any explanation, an item it had first posted in February 2006. Its subject matter was a number of *fatwa* on the permissibility or otherwise of...yes, the burning alive of the enemies of Islam. While some scholars have regarded it as a punishment that only Allah could administer, others cite the precedent allegedly established by Abu Bakr, the father-in-law of Mohammed, and from whom descended the Sunni line of Caliphs. According to the *fatwa* in question, a certain Iyas bin Abd Yali had turned traitor, and was sentenced to death as an apostate: 'Abu Bakr ordered a fire to be lit in the Medina mosque, and then he pitched Iyas into it. May Allah maximise the reward of the Caliph of the messenger of Allah for his zeal for Islam.'

Burning alive was not the sole prerogative of ISIS. Both in Pakistan and neighbouring Afghanistan, it is an accepted punishment for those accused (always falsely) of desecrating a Koran. On March 20, 2015, not in one of Afghanistan's culturally Palaeolithic tribal regions, but in Kabul, a 27-year-old Afghan woman, Farkhununda, was accused of burning a *Koran* (as you do in Afghanistan), seized by an all-male mob numbering hundreds and then, as police watched approvingly, was stamped on, run over by a car, burned alive, and her charred corpse thrown in a river. The religion of peace. Following this atrocious crime, the imam at the local Wazi Akbar Khan Mosque took the side of the murderers: 'I am warning the government not to arrest those who did this, because it will mean an uprising.' As always, the woman's murder had nothing to do with burning a *Koran*. She had in fact criticised the conduct of a local imam who had been selling worthless trinkets to the poorest members of his congregation. Burning her alive for a 'crime' she did not commit was the easiest way to silence her, and to demonstrate yet again how Islam deals with women who do not know their place. Here once more we have Islam living up to what Obama described as its 'proud tradition of tolerance'.

The *post facto* convolutions of some on the left over the Rushdie affair belatedly produced an illuminating and, in this case, amusing convergence with the right. Following the *fatwah* against Rushdie, dyed-in-the-wool Thatcher loyalist Norman Tebbit denounced Rushdie as 'an outstanding villain' with 'a record of despicable acts of betrayal of his upbringing, religion [this from an agnostic], adopted home and nationality', while professional feminist, self-defined 'Marxist' and cultural relativist Germaine Greer chipped in with her description of Rushdie as 'a megalomaniac, an Englishman with a dark skin'.(sic!) Tory Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe confidently asserted, as the novel's sales boomed, that not only the Thatcher government, but 'the British people' had 'no affection for this book', while his devout Prime Minister deplored that just as Christians had suffered insults 'which are deeply offensive to some of us', 'that is what is happening to Islam'. Yet however much they might find criticism or parody of their faith offensive, unlike Muslims, Christians today do not resort to murder and mayhem. In addition to prominent Tories of the time, other members of the right-wing establishment joined the chorus of Rushdie-baiters. The historian Hugh Trevor-Roper let it be known that he would 'not shed a tear if some British Muslims,

deploring his manners, should waylay him in a dark street and seek to improve them'. I am not an expert on criminal law, but even so, this comment could be seen as bordering on incitement to violence or worse, since it was directed against a named person. Then, inevitably, there were the clerics who rallied to the defence of a faith that sought the subjugation if not elimination of their own. Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits condemned Penguin books for publishing Rushdie's novel, while the paedophile-protector Robert Runcie, Archbishop of Canterbury, proposed an extension of the then existing blasphemy laws to include the protection of Islam. Overseas, apartheid South Africa joined with Muslim states and India in banning the book. United, they each stood firm against what was, albeit belatedly, depicted by the SWP as the rising tide of Islamophobia.

The *Daily Mail* is universally regarded by the far left as the embodiment and mouthpiece of all that it detests: xenophobia, organised religion (as long as it is that of Christianity), the Tory party, monarchy...the whole right-wing package. No less hostile than Tebbit to an author whom both despised as a mouthy, atheist, apostate, colonial, leftist upstart, in 2007, when the Queen awarded a knighthood to Rushdie, the *Mail* seized the opportunity to renew its vendetta against the godless Nobel Prize winner. Day after day, the paper denounced the award as a provocation to Muslims, and as one likely to lead to violent protests. But in taking this stand, though perhaps unwittingly, the normally impeccable monarchist *Mail* was in effect challenging the hallowed ancient prerogative of the sovereign to award titles to whomever she pleased, irrespective of any possible domestic or global political repercussions, or annoyance to Tory newspaper editors. The *Mail* was also implying that Muslims anywhere in the world could, by threats of or actual violence, exercise a veto over decisions made by the UK's head of state. Queen, country, tradition, faith...all, if the *Mail* was to have its way, were obliged to assent to the *fatwa* of a dead Iranian cleric. And this in fact is exactly what the Sharia left did, albeit belatedly. Alerted after 9/11 to the need to eliminate any differences that might endanger its alignment with Islam, just as it had in the matter of another other awkward leftist 'shibboleth', gay rights, it found itself speaking with the same voice as outraged Muslims and, as bonus, also on this occasion, that of the secular and clerical right.

At this point, it seems appropriate to define more precisely what is meant by 'the left'. Traditionally, the Left has been divided into a number of tendencies and organisations. There is the broad, mainstream 'social democratic' left which, as it names implies, seeks social change by exclusively democratic, mainly parliamentary means. The UK Labour Party, founded in 1900 by the trade unions, from the beginning set itself this goal. Until 2013, it was a member of the Socialist International, founded in 1889, which grouped together parties similar to Labour in methods and aims if not name. Its withdrawal, along with a number of other large western social democratic parties, was in response to the admission into the International of a number of 'third world' parties that while claiming to be socialist, were in no way democratic, some even ruling one party states. The UK Labour Party, together with other like-minded centre-left left parties, then founded the Progressive Alliance. Perhaps the last straw was the admission of the Palestinian Fatah to full membership in 2012, a party that organises and applauds the murder of Israel Jews. See Chapters 5 and 17.

Then there is the 'far left', which can be divided into two categories, not on account of their goals or origins, which are broadly the same, but their tactics. There

are groups or self-styled parties competing with the Labour Party quite openly in their own names, even standing for Parliament on their own account or as part of a coalition, such as the Stalinist Communist Party of Britain, the (ex) Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, and the now defunct Revolutionary Workers Party, previously the Socialist Labour League, led by Gerry Healy. Then there are those organisations which operate, sometimes secretly as 'entrists', within much larger organisations, chiefly the Labour Party and 'white collar' and public sector trade unions. Both categories describe themselves, (with entrists, for reasons of secrecy, *sotto voce*) as revolutionary, being totally opposed to the existing political and economic system, nearly always claiming descent from one or other branches of Russian communism, and all of which, whether Stalinist or Trotskyist in origin, subscribe to the Leninist principle of the 'vanguard party', the elite that unlike the masses, alone knows the correct path to the socialist future.

For all its considerable efforts and in the case of the Gaddafi-funded Workers Revolutionary Party, resources, the revolutionary or far left has never remotely come near to achieving the goal it set itself upon the founding of the Muscovite Communist Party of Great Britain in 1920, namely that of replacing the Labour Party as the dominant political representative of the organised working class. Over the decades, a wide range of strategies have been employed to achieve this goal, all of them proving abject failures. One recommended by Lenin was for the Communist Party to draw the Labour Party into 'united front' actions which had as their purpose the 'exposure' of its leaders as traitors to the working class when, as was assumed to be inevitable, they failed to deliver on the undertakings they had given. Another tactic, the brainchild of Stalin, was to discredit the labour and trade union leaders, not by proposals of joint action, but by crude abuse, denouncing them as fascists, to be more specific, 'social fascists', that is, fascists disguised as socialists. In Germany, following the emergence of the Nazis as a major political force after the Reichstag elections of September 1930, the prospect of a Hitler regime was welcomed by German Stalinist leaders as the necessary prelude to a communist revolution, hence the slogan of the time, 'after Hitler comes our turn'. To accelerate this process, and to hasten the crushing of the 'main enemy', the 'social fascists', the Stalinists entered into tactical alliances with the Nazis, even voting in 1931 for their referendum to unseat the Social Democratic administration in the state of Prussia. Fanatically pursued from 1928 to 1934, this tactic succeeded in provoking a near civil war within the left, so weakening the German workers movement that it was unable to prevent the victory of Hitler in 1933. This policy was vehemently opposed by the now exiled Trotsky, who counterposed to it a united front of the left parties to defend themselves and democracy against the assaults of the Nazis.

A third strategy, also the creation of Stalin, is the formation of broad 'popular front' movements that ostensibly are independent of any leftist party control, and which campaign for a single, very limited goal, the two favourites always being, as they are now with the far left-manipulated 'Unite Against Fascism' and 'Stop the War Coalition', against war and fascism. The classic example of this strategy was the Stockholm Peace Appeal. Launched by a decision of the Soviet Communist Party Politburo in January 1950, the Appeal, drafted by Stalin, was unanimously adopted by delegates attending a rally in the Swedish capital in March of the same year. In addition to the Stalinist contingent, who were fully appraised as to the true purpose of the exercise, which was not world peace but the facilitating of Kremlin

expansionism by means of western disarmament, were the usual collection of 'useful idiots', to coin Lenin's cynical but apt description, ranging from turn-the-other-cheek clergymen to guilt-ridden western radicals and naïve pacifists. No one present at the Stockholm convention had any difficulty endorsing an Appeal drafted by a despotic mass murderer who commanded the world's largest conventional military force, stationed an army of occupation in Eastern Europe that would be deployed in 1953 in East Germany, 1956 in Hungary and 1968 in Czechoslovakia to crush resistance to Stalinist rule, and had the previous year acquired the means, with the help of a number of strategically placed spies, to manufacture nuclear weapons. Indeed, when in 1949 the USSR succeeded in testing its first atomic bomb, it was heralded, in Orwellian fashion, by the Kremlin-controlled 'Peace Committees' as 'the weapon of peace', an exact secular analogue to Islam as the 'religion of peace'. In all respects, Stalin's 'selective pacifism' was identical to that practised by the Corbynistas in their opposition to NATO, together with support for anything but peaceful Islamic Jihadis or any regime that in one way or another, was opposed to the western democracies. Indeed, some of the parallels are quite uncanny. In order to counter the mistaken assumption, one that had no basis in its text, that the Stockholm Appeal was directed against all wars and nuclear weapons, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party instructed the campaign's organisers to combat the 'ideologically harmful' concept of 'indiscriminate pacifism', certainly not a charge that can be brought against the discriminating pacifism of the Corbynista Stop the War Coalition, which, as a declared matter of principle, only protests against military actions by western powers. (This determined its response to the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 and the Hamas pogrom of October 7, 2023 - See Appendix XIV)

Following the precedent set by Stalin, the organisers of these fronts see to it that they are given a respectable profile with the aid of sponsorship by prominent establishment figures. For example, former Tory Prime Minister David Cameron, despite being denounced every week in the SWP's *Socialist Worker* as a sworn enemy of the British working class, was one of the sponsors of the SWP-dominated front, Unite Against Fascism. More than balancing the secular right were former London Mayor, obsessive anti-Zionist and WRP fellow traveller Ken Livingstone, Corbynista Labour MP and Mao apologist Diane Abbott and the anti-apartheid campaigner and also vehement anti-Zionist, the former Labour Minister Peter Hain, and in the non-partisan centre, Baroness Lawrence, the mother of the murdered black teenager Stephen Lawrence. Like all such popular front operations, affiliations to UAF were secured from individuals and organisations that had absolutely nothing to do with socialism or the broader labour movement, such as the disgraced, corrupt and legally ousted ex-Mayor of Tower Hamlets, Lutfur Rahman, and the two main Muslim pressure groups, the Muslim Council of Britain and the Muslim Association of Britain, both of which in turn had direct links with the anti-Semitic and theocratic Muslim Brotherhood and its Jihadist offshoot, Hamas.

The anti-Zionism of some of its leading sponsors and Muslim affiliates, and the fact that the leading posts in UAF were under the control of the pro-Jihadi Socialist Workers Party, inevitably resulted, as Peter Tatchell pointed out, in a blind eye being turned towards manifestations of Muslim anti-Semitism, while any criticism of Islam was regarded as evidence of 'Islamophobia' and even fascism. Here the SWP had a free hand, because one of the recurring features of operations such as

this is that once having sponsored or affiliated to it, those who have done so are only too willing to sit back and leave the staffing, policy and day-to-day administration of the campaign to the professionals, the cadres of the leftist group or party that created the campaign in the first place. Whatever their ostensible aims, the long-term goal of such fronts is to attract publicity for and to win recruits to the party, and possibly even gain access to financial resources.

Pursuing these not always compatible objectives involves sustaining a delicate balancing act between promoting the aims of the broader campaign while at the same time, discreetly harnessing it to goals that have little or nothing to do with its official objectives, as was the case with Stalin's Stockholm operation. This was the significance of the warning by the SWP's Callinicos not to 'down the winning formula for our broad movement with all sorts of political [for which read 'socialist'] demands'. The inevitable result has been that Jihadist Islam has set the pace and determines the agenda, being perfectly happy to endorse any amount of anti-Zionist invective generated by the Sharia left but remaining always resolutely opposed to any introduction of socialism, feminism, gay rights and the rest of the 'Shibboleths' of the traditional leftist programme. Consequently, the show can only be kept on the road by ensuring that nothing the campaign organisers say or do will offend the religious sensitivities of their ultra-conservative Muslim partners, leading in some cases to the most grotesque gestures of compliance with Sharia law, for example the segregation of men and women on demonstrations and at public meetings, *kuffar* women wearing hijabs, and not holding meetings in pubs. Deliberately or not, the Sharia left certainly behaves as if it is familiar with the article in the Hamas Covenant (number 22) that condemns socialism as a creation of the World Jewish Conspiracy. In true Stalinist fashion, anything goes, literally, if that is what it takes to sustain Callinicos's 'winning formula'. This might explain why not once, but on a number of occasions, Jews have omitted from lists of what are described as victims of the Nazi Holocaust. (See Chapter 5)

As its name implies, the SWP quite openly operates as a party opposed to all others. However, with the strategy known as 'entryism', instead of openly confronting the Labour Party as a rival or even enemy, far leftists enter the party as ostensible loyal members, and by dissemblance and deceit, seek to gain leading positions within its official structures. In the short term, entryism can bring limited gains so long as the entrists do not show their full hand, and are able to keep secret from those they seek to displace the nature and long-term goals of the operation. It is therefore rare for entryists to state their strategy so bluntly as did Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor, John McDonnell, who with Ken Livingstone, if not as an actual member, was closely associated with the Trotskyist Workers Revolutionary Party in the 1980s, at the time of the publication of their weekly Gaddafi-funded *Labour Herald*. After the implosion of the WRP following the exposure of the spectacular sex-life of its aging leader Gerry Healy in 1985, McDonnell, deputy to GLC Leader Livingstone from 1981 to 1986, began his ascent to Corbyn's second in command via local government in London and Labour MP in 1997. But all the time, it seems his membership of the Labour Party was essentially a tactical one, because at the Socialist Workers Party 'Marxism' event of 2011, he assured a largely non and, in many cases, anti-Labour audience that he was 'not in the Labour Party as a believer of the Labour Party.' It was 'a tactic. Simple as that.' Four years later, following his election as Leader of the Labour Party in September 2015, Corbyn appointed the one-man 'entryist' McDonnell as his shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer.

When not individual entryists like McDonnell, but organised groups enter the Labour Party, sooner or later, somehow, the truth will out and, as in the classic entryist undertaking of the so-called 'Militant Tendency', the entryists can find themselves being rudely ejected by a party leadership that is hostile to their methods, policies and ideology. Back out in the cold, they will again be just one more grouplet snapping and snarling at the heels of a party they fondly believed could be captured by a few clever tricks.

But 2015 saw an entirely novel variant of entryism, 'entryism by invitation' With new members now enfranchised at the cost of only £3.00, an unknown but for sure substantial number of activists of far leftist groups saw an opportunity to capture the party's machinery and head it an entirely new direction, not only domestically, but also, and this became crucially important, internationally, by voting for Corbyn in the leadership contest that followed the resignation of Ed Miliband after Labour's defeat in the general election of that year..

Prior to the emergence of Corbyn, the post-war Labour Party had won nine out of the 21 general elections it had contested. But for the far left, its goal of a fully socialist economy was as remote as ever, even receding, not only as result of a number of large-scale privatisations under successive Tory government's, but also as a consequence of fundamental changes in British society. Starting in the 1960s, the old heavy industries that were the backbone of the trade unions and the major source of the Labour vote, were in irreversible decline, accelerated by a Tory strategy of privatisation and 'de-industrialisation' designed to convert the UK into a service-based economy centred on the City and bolstered by massive financial investment from the Far East, the oil states of the Middle East and after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, even from Russia. At the same time, the newer manufacturing and higher tech industries began to relocate in the opposite direction, to the east, where labour came cheap and trade unions were illegal. As the number of industrial workers in the UK shrank, there was a simultaneous rapid increase in the numbers of students entering into and graduating from higher education. These trends were closely related to the drastic reshaping of the social profile of the UK left. In 1950, 35% of the UK's labour force was engaged in manufacturing and 15% in the primary extractive sector. Today, manufacturing, once the core of the UK economy, employs barely 10% of the work force, while coal mining has virtually vanished.

The precipitate contraction of the UK's traditional industries has been mirrored by a steep fall in trade union membership, from a peak of 12 million in the late 1970s to half that number in 2020. Accompanying this decline, from a post-war record of 24 million working days lost in strikes in 1972, the average annual rate in the years between 2010 and 2014 fell to 647 thousand, barely one third of the average annual rate during the Second World War! No wonder the neo-Bolsheviks were looking elsewhere for an audience and action. Meanwhile employment in the tertiary service sector had mushroomed, generating 80% of GDP, while public administration, health and education accounted for approaching 30% of all UK employment. Feeding and responding to this expansion had been a parallel surge in higher education. In 1950, less than 5% of school pupils could expect to progress through the educational system to degree level. Today, that percentage is fast approaching the official target of 50%. In the academic year 2012-13, 2.3 million students were enrolled in under-graduate or post-graduate studies.

This profound and rapid double shift in employment and social structure was inevitably reflected in the social composition of all far leftist groups which, without exception were anyway already predominately middle class. Their centres of activity and recruitment shifted increasingly towards the campuses of former polytechnics turned universities, and the public service sector in which many, mainly 'humanities' graduates, make their professional careers. Adjusting to these trends, and responding to the upsurge of student militancy in the late 1960s, some on far left saw students as a 'new vanguard' that could spark a socialist revolution. The talk, often in mockney accents, was still about the class struggle, but those doing most of the talking were far removed from the ever-shrinking battlefield. Increasingly detached from the everyday life, problems and attitudes of what we might, for want of a better term, call 'ordinary people', the far left had become, by the onset of the new Millennium, in its social composition overwhelmingly petit bourgeois. Industrial workers were an endangered species, increasingly outnumbered by students and graduates, a development which later provided a fertile recruiting ground for the Corbynista Momentum and, together with Muslims, a substantial source of Labour votes in the 2017 general election.

As in the USA, UK campus life became increasingly dominated by an arrogant, noisy, even at times thuggish, intolerant, shallow, conformist but well-organised far left minority, a slogan-chanting, lumpen intelligentsia, whose thinking, such as it was and is, had been moulded by all the fads and fashions that today comprise what is known as wokery and political correctness, and which in lieu of recruits from the traditional working class, now served as the main source of cadres for the far leftist groups operating either in or outside the Labour Party, and in the burgeoning anti-Zionist and bogus anti-war movements. These processes set the stage for the birth of what I have been calling Sharia or *dhimmi* leftism, which rests on the assumption that a significant part of the forces for the regeneration of the left were now to be found amongst the rapidly increasing number of young Muslims living both in the UK and across the western diaspora. In England, a substantial and growing number of traditional Labour constituencies in London, the Midlands and the North had, due to both immigration and demographic factors, experienced a rapid growth of Muslim voters and elected politicians at local and more recently, national level, both being factors affecting processes under consideration. Since these Muslim constituents or rather, their well-heeled leaders, identified Israel and Zionist Jews as their principal enemy, but not capitalism, the Sharia left of necessity had to embrace the same enmities, while devising tortuous justifications for abandoning the left's traditional hostility to religious fanaticism, censorship, theocracy, homophobia, misogyny, rape, terrorism, child abuse and anti-Semitism.

As these two processes, 'de-industrialisation' and Muslim immigration, although stemming from very different causes, combined to create the social and political conditions that gave rise to the Sharia left, there had simultaneously emerged an increasingly theocratic Islam in the Middle East and Iran, which quite quickly began to exert a powerful force of attraction on young Muslims in the diaspora, including the UK. An example, albeit in microcosm, of how these two processes, the decline of an 'old left', essentially social democratic and based on the traditional working class, and the rise of global Jihadism, interacted, was the emergence of the Stalinist Arthur Scargill's Socialist Labour Party. Having wrecked the once-powerful National Union of Mineworkers by launching a doomed, politically-motivated strike against pit closures, without a national ballot as the

rules required, at a time of the year when coal reserves were at their highest, with the most productive pits still working, and coal imports readily forthcoming from his Stalinist comrades in Poland, Scargill then launched another doomed venture, his Socialist Labour Party. Before it too faded entirely from the scene, it blazed a trail for the Sharia left when it its youth paper, *Spark*, no doubt named after Lenin's pre-revolutionary journal of the same name, *Iskra*, hailed as a 'hero of the revolutionary youth' a young British Muslim, Asif Mohammed Hanif. He had executed a 'martyrdom operation' against Jewish civilians in Tel Aviv in 2003, an act carried out, so Scargill's paper claimed, 'in the spirit of internationalism', one that was conspicuously lacking when in December 1981, Scargill supported the suppression of the Polish Solidarity Trade Union movement by the Kremlin-imposed military junta of General Jaruzelski.

Organisationally separate from the far, extreme, or revolutionary left, is a broader left which functions openly, sometimes in a loosely organised way, as the left wing of mainstream left of centre organisations such as the Labour Party and the trade unions affiliated to it. This left, or rather tendencies and individuals within it, can quite easily be drawn into common action with the far left on certain issues, such as, for example...anti-Zionism. The readiness of Ken Livingstone, former Labour MP and Mayor of London, to endorse all manner of anti-Israeli causes, which began when closely associated with the Workers Revolutionary Party, and the former Islamophile 'Respect' MP George Galloway, who had equally close ties with the SWP, are two classic examples of such collaborations. For the record, it should be pointed out that the vehemence and persistence of Livingstone's crusade against Israel earned him well-founded accusations of anti-Semitism, which led first his suspension, followed by his resignation, while Galloway was captured on film in Baghdad lauding the many qualities of the sadistic war criminal and butcher of the Kurds, Saddam Hussein.

Galloway, like Livingstone and former Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn, was handsomely paid by the Iranian theocracy to make English language broadcasts on its London-based Press TV channel. He also shared a platform in Baghdad in 2002 with a Russian Nazi, Vladimir Zhirinovsky, the Holocaust deniers Serge Thion and Jewish conspiracy theorist James Thring, a guest speaker at one of Corbyn's Westminster functions. Back in the UK, Galloway posed as a man of the left, and for some years collaborated with the SWP in Respect, a party almost wholly dependent on Muslim votes. This, together with his Catholicism and close relationship with homophobic dictatorships may well have influenced his response when, confronted with the accusation by human rights campaigner Peter Tatchell that Iran executes gays, he called Tatchell, who is himself gay, 'the pink end of the khaki war machine'.

Anti-Zionism, and an endorsement of Jihadism, reach far beyond the organised Sharia left. Even politicians and public figures not normally associated with the far left can be heard indulging in anti-Israel venom. Former Labour MP Peter Hain, a (rightly) respected veteran anti-apartheid campaigner and then Labour government minister, not only declared that Israel was 'by definition racist and will have to be dismantled.' but that if Israel did not agree to its being 'dismantled' it would be 'invit[ing] a blood bath'. That is as near as it can get to justifying genocide. This, from a Labour MP! Another (former) Labour MP, Tam Dalyell, like Healy of the WRP, an admirer of Gaddafi and who, like the Sharia left, made it a point of honour to always oppose any British military operations against dictatorships no matter

however unsavoury, complained on one occasion that Prime Minister Tony Blair's foreign policy was dictated to him by a 'Jewish Cabal'.

This judgment found endorsement from both the Sharia left and the Neo-Nazi right. Presuming to read Dalyell's mind, the SWP's Paul Foot stepped in to explain that when Dalyell said 'Jewish pressure on Blair and Bush', 'he means Zionist pressure'. The openly anti-Semitic, Holocaust-denying British National Party preferred the original and, one suspects, intended version: '[Dalyell's] crime is that he dared tell the truth, which is that people like Lord Levy, whose first loyalty is to Israel, dominate the Blair government.' Likewise, when the BBC's Panorama screened what many would have seen as a leftist-slanted investigation into what its producers claimed was a Zionist conspiracy to influence US government policy in the Middle East ('a story of people who stick together'), the veteran British Nazi John Tyndall crowed that 'certain things are coming to light which not long ago would have been tightly censored and suppressed...We are witnessing a gigantic conspiracy being unveiled.' As we shall see repeatedly, this convergence of the far left with the far right occurs because, while their strictly domestic agendas rarely overlap except when it comes to the influence allegedly exerted by a so-called Zionist or Israeli 'lobby' over UK institutions, it is a different story in matters in any way related to foreign policy, not only those concerning the Middle East, but also Russia (See Addenda, and Appendix XIV).

Corbyn and the SWP never had any problem collaborating with the Muslim Association of Britain and the UK General Union of Palestinian Students in joint 'Stop the War [against Saddam and the Taliban] Coalition campaigns, despite both organisations having published and distributed on 'anti-war' marches an anti-Semitic hoax akin to the Muslim best seller, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, titled *The Franklin 'Prophecy'*. It purports to be a speech by Benjamin Franklin to Congress warning of the Jewish threat to the newly independent United States. It is, and has always been known to be, the invention of a US Nazi, William Dudley Pelley, dating from 1934. Promoting Nazi slanders against the Jews did not however impair either organisation's smooth working relationship with the SWP, despite its being the founder of first the anti-Nazi League and, more recently, Unite Against Fascism. Evidently, there are two kinds of anti-racism, with the one that includes opposition to anti-Semitism being yet another 'Shibboleth' that needs to be discarded when collaborating with Muslim pressure groups.

Perhaps the most 'extreme' of these groups is the Muslim Public Affairs Committee. Its four objectives are listed as '*Jihad*, anti-Zionism, institutional revival and accountability'. One of its activities has been to attempt the unseating of Jewish MPs by instructing Muslims not to vote for them. (A similar strategy of targeting pro-Israel MPs was also favoured by 'Respect' chief George Galloway, who enlisted the support of the Committee in his bid to become Mayor of London in 2016.) These and other 'anti-Zionist' policies and connections resulted in well-founded accusations that the Committee was anti-Semitic. The Committee recycled Neo-Nazi materials on its website and quite openly supported the Holocaust denials of David Irving (one of a galaxy of far right Corbyn admirers - see Afterword) to the extent that it published an article by Professor Kevin Macdonald, a key witness for Irving in the historian's failed libel action against Professor Deborah Lipstadt. Founder member Asghar Bukhari posted the following Jihadist proclamation on his Facebook page: 'Muslims who fight against the [Israeli] occupation of their lands are Mujahidin and are blessed by Allah. Any Muslim who

fight and dies against Israel and dies is a martyr and will be granted paradise...There is no greater oppressor on this earth than the Zionists, who murder little children for sport.' (Once again, Jews as baby killers.) In the same spirit, the Committee's Facebook page carried a message to Jews: 'Take your Holocaust, roll it nice and tight and shove it up your (be creative)!' So flagrant was the Committee's anti-Semitism that the normally Jihadi-indulgent National Union of Students felt obliged in 2004 to pass a resolution denying it a platform on campuses. However, none of this deterred the SWP from subsequently providing a platform for a committee spokesperson in the columns of its *Socialist Worker*.

Although historically aligned with the Labour Party, the UK trade union movement has no political restrictions on membership, and therefore is a prime target for 'entryist' operations by leftist groups, those of the Shariaist variety being no exception. Success greeted their efforts when in September 2014, the Trades Union Congress, having already severed its links with Histadrut, the Israeli trade union movement, without consulting members views on the subject (a decision first advocated by Corbin and Livingstone some thirty years previously) then voted to support a boycott of Israeli goods. The Sharia left anti-Israel campaign in the trade unions then escalated into violence against Jews, as it so frequently does. In July 2015, at the annual TUC festival in Devon commemorating the deportation to Australia in 1834 of the Tolpuddle Martyrs, pro-Palestinian activists, with the connivance of the event's organisers, were able to eject from the venue Jewish members of the Bournemouth Action for Israel, a group which, unlike those who did the ejecting, supported a two-state solution and unity between Jewish and Arab trade unionists. As the Bournemouth group were erecting their stall, an anti-Zionist goon squad attempted to wreck it, tearing up its leaflets while chanting the Sharia left mantras 'fascists, [sic], apartheid, baby killers'. Instead of calling the police to arrest and charge the mobsters with criminal damage and assault, a Festival 'security' official told the Jews to 'leave in your own interests.' Sharia thuggery works - if it is allowed to.

Addenda: The attempted assassination of Salman Rushdie.

On August 12, 2022, as the writer began his address on free speech at a literary event in New York, a Muslim man, Hadi Matar, rushed the stage and stabbed him repeatedly with a knife, wounding Rushdie in the neck, liver and the face, the latter resulting in the loss of an eye. After his arrest, police found on his person a driving license, not his own name, but a false one, 'Hassan Mughinyah'. This fictitious name was believed to be connected in some way with Hassan Nasrallah, the current leader of the Iranian proxy militia Hezbollah, and Imad Mughinyeh, another Hezbollah leader, who was killed in a CIA operation in Syria in 2008. The attack was greeted in Iran by two ultra-orthodox dailies, *Khorosan*, with the headline, 'Satan on the path to hell', and by *Vatan-e Emrouz's* 'A knife in the neck of Salman Rushdie'. That same evening, on his TV show Real Time, the atheist comedian and political commentator Bill Maher, a close friend of Rushdie, and one of his guests, TV pundit Piers Morgan, made the following comments on the attempt to implement the fatwah placed on Rushdie 33 years previously by Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khomeini:

Maher: 'A dear friend of mine got stabbed today, Salman Rushdie...He was stabbed by someone name Hajj Hadi Matar. We don't know the motivation yet, but Salman did have some enemies in the past as I recall, so I'm guessing Hadi is not Amish [a pacifist Christian sect]. Sal was giving a lecture - how about this for irony - about how the US is a safe haven for exiled writers and other artists under threat of persecution. Making that speech is unthinkable in most Muslim countries. [Just as saying so is on most western TV channels.] Salman Rushdie living in most Muslim countries without getting stabbed every day is unthinkable. So don't come at me with Islamophobic. Phobic means fear [actually, irrational fear] Well, Sal had a good reason to be fearful. And when you say phobic it's just a way to shut off debate...that you're transphobic, Islamophobic...we should have a debate about this. I'm sorry but you know these things don't go away. Islam is still a much more fundamentalist religion than any of the other religions in the world, and that means they take what's in the holy books seriously, and that has been dangerous for a long time and it's still dangerous.'

Morgan: 'I want to draw your attention to a quote from Salman Rushdie. "The defence of free speech begins when people say something you can't stand. You often have to defend people you find outrageous, unpleasant and disgusting." [As Rosa Luxemburg put it, 'freedom is for the one who thinks differently', and George Orwell, 'is telling people what they don't want to hear'.] And that is the point I think people have forgotten in this debate about free speech. It's not about the right of people you agree with...it's about your ability to listen to people whose opinions you might staunchly disagree with. You might hate their opinions. You might hate them. But you should be able to tolerate their right to have a different opinion.'

Try saying that to the 60-strong baying, spitting, mob of wokistas teenagers who shouted down a pupil at an elite English girls school in October 2021 for suggesting that biology had something do with determining gender. Or to 11-year-old pupils at another private girls school who reported their teacher to the school head for 'transphobia' for saying 'good afternoon girls'. The teacher then had to apologise to the class because, so the story goes, one of the girls claimed to be a boy. The girls' behaviour was applauded by a *Daily Mirror* journalist. I would have removed the 'boy' from the class and contacted 'his' parents, telling them 'he' should be trans[fer]red to a boys' or co-ed school.

While deploring the attempt to murder Rushdie, without exception, the UK politicians who did so predictably took care not to even allude to the religion or motives of the would-be assassin which, within a matter of hours, had become public knowledge. Across the channel, in a secular country that had experienced more than its fair share of Allah-inspired terror, no such woke inhibitions were on display. For the Republican Party, Eric Citotti saluted Rushdie as 'a symbol against Islamist barbarism', while Aurore Bergé for President Macron's Renaissance Party described Rushdie as a 'global symbol of resistance to Islamist totalitarianism'. Unlike the UK left, which cannot say enough kind words about the religion of peace, Olivier Faure for the Socialist Party declared that 'radical Islamists who think they can silence freedom of thought and writing will never prevail.' In France, yes. But I can name at least one country where they are making good progress towards that goal.

Convergence

In this work, I describe occasions when movements and individuals from the extremes of the political spectrum, either by design or circumstance, have shared similar policies or engaged in joint activities. Almost invariably, this convergence has either concerned matters of foreign policy, mainly in relation to Russia and Israel, or one related to the second, the so-called 'Jewish question'. (See Appendix T) The reader will be interested to learn that there is an organisation which caters for and brings together those on the far left and right who share an animus towards the Jews. It goes by the name of Keep Talking. Topics featured have included conspiracy theories about Israel (funding ISIS) and Jewish public figures such as George Soros, supposedly behind the murder of Labour MP Jo Cox. Keep Talking also exposes 'false flag' operations...9/11, London terror attacks etc etc. Regular attendees at Keep Talking events have included from the far right, Jewish conspiracy theorist James Thring, and, from the far left, Corbyn *confidante* Elleanne Green, who on her (secret) Palestine Live website, cited, approvingly, Hitler's *Mein Kampf* on the world Jewish conspiracy. (See Appendix T) A full list of topics, together with one of speakers, is available on line, at Community Security Trust. One attendee and speaker who straddled the extremes of left and right was Jeremy Corbyn's elder brother, climate change denier Piers. Despite his liking for Trump and peddling of a range of conspiracy theories, including Jewish ones, Jeremy said 'we fundamentally agree'. (See Afterword)

14 Jeremy the Tank Engine

Just how effective - and likewise destructive - the influence exerted by Shari leftism within the mainstream left can be was exemplified by the contest for the Labour Party leadership, which became vacant after the resignation of Ed Miliband following Labour's defeat in the General Election of May 2015. One of the candidates, initially seen as an outsider, was the far-leftist back-bench Labour MP for Islington North, Jeremy Corbyn. Corbyn was the classic fellow-traveller, or less politely if no less accurately, 'useful idiot', because he had travelled. not only with Jihadi Islam, but like many similar dupes who came before him, with Stalinism. What we know about his family background suggests that the latter may well have been an inheritance from his parents, who met while campaigning on behalf of the republican cause in the Spanish civil war, over which, by a series of purges, the Spanish Communist Party came to exert a disastrous predominance. Be that as it may, the way he tells it, they were 'both peace campaigners'. But then Corbyn had advocated a 'negotiated settlement' via a diplomatic 'back channel' with the Islamic State, so why not one between Franco's fascists and the Spanish republic?

As is the case with many occupations, an MP cannot choose all whom they associate with, whether at Westminster, in their local party, or among their constituents. Politics is a team game. But beyond that, an MP, especially one not encumbered by ministerial responsibilities, also has the opportunity, and some would say obligation, to seek out the company of those with whom they share similar interests both at Westminster, and the wider world. As to the first, there are numerous cross-party and party groupings an MP can belong to if they so wish. Examples of the former, which as of 2017 numbered 630, (only 30 less than the total number of MPs), were the Jazz Appreciation and Pancreatic Cancer groups, and of the latter, the Labour Friends of Israel and Labour Friends of Palestine. As membership of such groupings is purely voluntary, it cannot be therefore by either chance or necessity that while neither Corbyn nor any of his inner circle belonged to the Israeli grouping, they all belonged to the Palestinian. Outside of Parliament, an MP is likewise free to support, found, join, promote, sponsor and participate in any cause or campaign that takes their fancy, so long as organisations they join or form do not support or stand candidates at local or national level against their own party or engage in illegal activity. Here too, the choices an MP makes, and therefore the company they keep as a result of them, will necessarily reflect their own interests, convictions and priorities. It is these political relationships, freely entered into and enduring, that bear out the truth of the saying that one should judge someone by the company they keep. And of all UK politicians, that could not have been truer of anyone than Jeremy Corbyn, who, although virtually unknown outside the Westminster village, in September 2015 was elected Leader of the Labour Party on the first ballot with 59% of the vote, 40% more than his closest contender.

From what was known of his political leanings before he became an MP, although a member of the Labour Party, Corbyn had not only been attracted to the Communist Party, but its staunchly pro-Moscow minority faction, the 'tankies', so described on account of their enthusiastic support for massive Red Army invasions of the Kremlin's brother communist states in Eastern Europe. From as early as

1983, when he first became a Labour MP, he was already writing a column for the Communist Party's *Morning Star*, which had been captured by the tankies and used as a vehicle for their ultra-Stalinist policies. The official party dissolved in 1991, becoming the Democratic Left, three years after the tankies had split away to form their own Communist Party of Britain and made the *Morning Star* their daily paper, for which Corbyn continued to write a weekly column. Bear in mind that this party was one of a number of organisations proscribed by the Labour Party, since it stood candidates in elections also contested by Labour, meaning that members of it were barred from membership of the Labour Party. Some might say that when Corbyn went with the tankies, it was a perverse choice for a human rights and peace campaigner, but then so were his associations with IRA terrorists, Jew-killing Jihadis, war criminal President Assad of Syria and his sympathies for President Putin of Russia and employment as a YouTube presenter by the hanging and stoning Ayatollahs of Iran. Even more extraordinary were his at least three documented meetings with Czech Intelligence operative Jan Dymic, two of them in the House of Commons, at a time when Czechoslovakia was still under Soviet occupation after the Kremlin's tanks crushed Dubcek's bid to create a 'socialism with a human face' in 1968. Soviet occupation, good, Israeli occupation, bad.

To put it bluntly, Corbyn's profile was that of the classic Kremlin fellow-traveller, or as Lenin described them, 'useful idiot', even to the extent of retaining his loyalty to Moscow after the collapse of the USSR in 1991, as can be seen from his response in the *Morning Star* to Putin's onslaught on the Ukraine, denial of Kremlin 'special operations' in the UK, and refusal to protest Moscow's war crimes committed in support of the Ba'athist regime in Syria. (Corbyn was a guest of President Assad in 2009, as were, in other years, some notorious far rightist politicians, including former BNP *Fuehrer* Nick Griffin and one time KKK Grand Wizard David Duke.) Two factors were at play in moulding the thinking, for want of a better word, that guided Corbyn's attitude to the Putin regime. (See Appendix XIV) The seeds were sown in the pre-1991 era, when, like all true fellow-travellers, Corbyn saw in the Soviet Union and by extension, its empire in Eastern Europe, both the socialist alternative to western capitalism and no less importantly, the counterweight to the military might of the US and its NATO and European Union allies.

With the demise of the USSR and the liberation of its former East European colonies, it was this second role played by the Kremlin which commanded Corbyn's support, together with Jihadi Islam, while leftist dictatorships in North Korea, Cuba, Nicaragua, Bolivia and Venezuela continued to perform the first. This was no side-line to his parliamentary responsibilities. As an always available useful idiot, he must surely hold the record for patronage, sponsorship and office-holding in fronts, bogus solidarity campaigns and operations that either seek to undermine the security of western liberal democracy, or at the very least, promote regimes and movements which reject its ethos, namely, the Campaign for (Western) Nuclear Disarmament, Unite Against Fascism (but not the Islamic version) and Stop the (Western) War Coalition, and pro-regime Cuba, Nicaragua, Venezuela and Palestine (for which read his 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah) Solidarity. The prototype for this species of bogus solidarity, which in reality serves purely as a propaganda mouthpiece for the regime in question, not as a means of support for the people it rules over, was the network of lavishly-funded 'Friendship Societies' with the USSR and its East European colonies established in the UK and other western countries after the Second World

War by the Kremlin and, more recently, the ‘twinning’ industry, with its VIP junkets and Potemkin tourism for the gullible and the corruptible. Corbyn’s support for the Kremlin’s post-Soviet expansionist foreign policy was neatly encapsulated in an article with the Orwellian title ‘NATO [sic!] Belligerence Endangers Us All’, published in the *Morning Star* of April 17, 2014, only a matter days after Putin had completed the illegal annexation of Crimea and invasion of Ukraine’s Donbas region. What we have here is an exposition of Corbynista armchair geo-politics, a *tour d’horizon* which smugly charts what its author believes is the terminal decline and fall of the West, and the rise of a ‘resurgent’ East:

...while the endless drama of meetings, lurid statements and predictions and mass demonstrations catches [should be ‘catch’...so much for prep school] the world’s eye, something more significant and fundamental is taking place. As the US moves into relative economic decline, China’s expansion and Russia’s huge energy reserves and location are moving the politics of the world into a different place...The broad historical sweep since the end of the Soviet Union showed two decades of unipolar US power. But now the resurgence of Russia [sic] and the enormous [capitalist] economic power of China are ending that.

Corbyn then gets down to specifics, first, the consequences of the dominance of the USA resulting from the demise of that bastion of peace and socialism, the Kremlin empire: ‘The history of conflicts since 1990 is grim.’ And each one is, as always, the fault of the West: ‘Hot wars took place in the Gulf, the former Yugoslavia, in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya, all involving the US and NATO’, with in every case, Corbyn backing the other side. Not a word about the Kremlin’s carnage of Muslims in Chechnya, the ‘ethnic cleansing’ of Muslims by Russian-backed Serbs in the former state of Yugoslavia, which Corbyn denied in a motion moved in the House of Commons, or the despotic nature of the regimes deposed in each case, whose fate he so obviously regretted... that of indicted war criminal Milosevic in Serbia, the Taliban theocracy in Afghanistan, the fascist regime of Saddam with its invasion of Kuwait and genocide of the Kurds, and the corrupt tyranny of Gaddafi, overthrown, not by NATO but his own people. In May 2017, when asked to name a military action by the UK since the Second World War he could describe as just, Corbyn was unable to do so. The converse necessarily followed that all those regimes whom Corbyn believed the UK fought against unjustly *were* waging a just war...Saddam, the Argentinian junta, Milosevic, the Taliban, the Islamic State.

Given his anti-Western stance in these conflicts, after being elected Labour Leader, Corbyn quite logically therefore refused to commit himself to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which obliges all members of NATO to come to each other’s assistance if attacked by a third party. The article had only been invoked once, by the USA after the terrorist attacks of 9/11, which, along with a galaxy of conspiracy theorists, Corbyn claimed had been ‘manipulated’ to justify the US attack on the Taliban. Corbyn’s stated refusal to honour Article 5 must have been music to the ears of Assad, Putin and Kim Jong-un, or any other totalitarian thug who intended to throw his weight about. But NATO was not the only villain of the piece. The European Union had also become a ‘tool of US policy’, which, in its turn, as he had claimed in article in the *Morning Star* dating from 2011, was controlled by Israel, or as his Syrian host, the war criminal President Assad

explained it to him in 2009, Israel was ‘the tail that wags the US dog’. It therefore followed logically, in accordance with Jewish conspiracy theory, that by using the USA as its proxy, Israel was also in effective control of not only NATO, but the European Union. What better reason then, when the opportunity came in the referendum of June 2016, to leave it?

Corbyn’s track record on Europe, beginning with his voting to leave in the referendum of 1975, had been one of consistent opposition to the UK’s membership of the European Union and its predecessors, invariably voting in the Commons against every measure that brought the UK into a closer relationship with its continental partners. As her master’s voice, Diane Abbott, put it, ‘in Jeremy’s heart of hearts, he’s a Brexiteer.’ At a meeting in 2009, he denounced the EU as a ‘European empire of the 21st century’, one ‘subservient to the wishes of NATO’, for which read the USA, a ‘massive great military Frankenstein’, ‘which will so be damaging to all of us.’ He expressed the hope that a referendum would be an opportunity for the UK to leave the EU. In 2016, his wish, and the result he sought, came, courtesy of Tory Prime Minister Cameron and UKIP. Understandably then, Corbyn’s Communist Party comrades had every reason to expect him to continue his opposition to the EU once he was elected Labour Leader in September 2015. In a statement celebrating his victory, the party claimed that ‘the forthcoming EU referendum will provide a huge opportunity [all opportunities are ‘huge’] for the labour movement to inflict a massive defeat [all defeats are ‘massive’] on the Tory Government, its City paymasters and the EU by campaigning against EU membership.’ Corbyn, it was hoped, and indeed expected, would lead this campaign for Brexit, an assumption based squarely on what the party knew to be his stance on this issue, one that he had made perfectly clear in the cited *Morning Star* article and his voting record in Parliament. The problem for Corbyn was that he had been elected Leader of a party that from being initially largely Eurosceptic, had over the decades become increasingly pro EU. After running what his Labour critics described as at best a ‘lukewarm’ campaign to remain, (some accused him of sabotaging it, even taking a holiday when he should have been on the stump), within hours of the announcement of the result, Corbyn was the first party leader to call for the activation of Article 50 that triggered the process of leaving, followed, contrary to the policy of his party, by his rejection of calls for a second referendum on the final deal.

As a self-styled peace campaigner, foreign policy had always been Corbyn’s main concern. What he had to say about the conflict between the Ukraine and the Kremlin therefore must surely have gladdened the hearts of the *Morning Star*’s Russophile readers. On March 18, 2014, only a month before Corbyn wrote the above quoted article, Russia had illegally annexed the Crimea, and used military force to create two puppet states in the Donbas, both actions being violations of international law that met with only token sanctions by western states dependent on Russian energy, and none at all from the United Nations. While Corbyn was careful to say that he ‘would [sic, not ‘do’] not condone Russian behaviour or expansion’, that is exactly what he did do, because then he added that ‘it was not unprovoked’, so the prime responsibility lay with whoever did the ‘provoking’, allegedly NATO and its Ukrainian puppets. This was also the opinion of his future ‘spin doctor’, Seumas Milne, who in the *Guardian* of March 5, 2014, insisted that ‘Putin’s absorption [sic] of the Crimea and support for the rebellion [sic] in Eastern Ukraine is clearly defensive’...just like the Kremlin’s invasion of Poland, Finland

and the Baltic states at the time of Stalin's pact with Hitler, and Hungary by Khrushchev and Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan by Brezhnev. Corbyn was a tireless campaigner against what he regarded as the illegal occupation of the West Bank by Israel. But when the invaders, occupiers - *and annexers*- were Russians and not Jews, much changed. The guilty party was NATO, not Putin: 'The expansion of NATO into Poland and the Czech Republic has particularly increased tensions with Russia.' This 'expansion into' was not, as Corbyn implies by the use of this term, imposed on the countries concerned, but was the result of a request for membership of NATO by the democratically-elected governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia, nations which had long and bitter memories of uninvited 'expansions' coming from the opposite direction, and had therefore sought protection from what Corbyn described euphemistically but also approvingly as a 'resurgent Russia'. Corbyn in fact seemed to be saying that unlike any western country or alliance, Russia had the right of veto over the foreign policies of countries close to or bordering on its territory, what is known in diplomatic language redolent of the Stalin-Hitler Pact of August 23, 1939 and the post-Second World War Potsdam agreements between the USSR, Britain and the USA, as a 'sphere of interest'.

While NATO was condemned for 'acting outside its own area' (as defined by both Putin and Corbyn), Corbyn clearly believed Russia did have legitimate concerns 'outside its own area', and even, it seemed, if allegedly provoked, could extend this 'area without any serious protest from the veteran anti-imperialist peace campaigner. While there were what Corbyn called 'huge questions about the West's interests in the Ukraine,' he had nothing to say about those of Putin in the same country, even though he had only just invaded and annexed vast slices of its territory. And 'huge' though these questions were, readers learned nothing about their nature, or their presumably no less huge answers. Instead, they were bombarded with Stalinist vintage denunciations of the USA: 'The overall issue [sic] is still one of the activities and expansionism of the post 1990 United States [not those of post-Soviet Russia]...The obsession with Cold War politics that exercises the NATO and EU leadership [there we have it again] is fuelling the crisis and underlines the case for a whole [sic] new approach to foreign policy.'

And once Corbyn became Labour Leader, 'new approach' it most certainly was. Such loyalty to the Kremlin cause surely deserved its reward, and it duly came even before Corbyn was elected in September 2015. Putin mouthpiece Fyodor Lukyanov, Editor of the journal *Russia in Global Affairs*, said 'Russia would certainly be pleased to see such a person at the head of either major party'. For once, the Kremlin spoke the truth. When challenged for the leadership by Owen Smith a year later, on July 9, Corbyn received the endorsement of the *Morning Star* in article by the veteran 'tankie' and Stalin apologist Andrew Murray, who had taken turns with Corbyn as chair of the Stop the (western) War Coalition, and was soon to become Corbyn's most trusted political adviser. Titled 'Corbyn is the best chance in a generation to break with Britain's blood-soaked militarism' (never mind about the Kremlin's), the article was devoted entirely to foreign policy issues, the common ground that had always been shared by the anti-Western Corbyn and the Muscovite Stalinists of the Communist Part of Britain. One good turn deserved another. In the run-up to the General Election of June 2017, Corbyn appointed the Stalinist Murray to head his election strategy team, Murray having previously resigned, officially at least, from the Communist Party, and then joined the Labour

Party to facilitate the appointment. Asked why he had chosen a notorious Stalinist and 40-year member of the Communist Party for such a crucial role in the election, all Corbyn could say was that Murray was a 'democratic socialist' and was a member of the Labour Party. The first was a blatant lie, while second was true but proved nothing as regards his politics. Trotskyist 'entrists', and Stalinist fellow-travellers like indeed Corbyn himself, have passed themselves off as loyal democratic socialists for decades, while from the far right, there is the case of a young Muslim woman who before being elected as a Labour councillor in Luton, had advertised her admiration for 'my man Hitler' on the internet. And she was only one of hundreds, possibly even thousands, who were able to reconcile their membership of the Labour Party with a similar hatred of the Jews. As for Murray's 'democracy', could perhaps Corbyn have had in mind the version practised by the 'German Democratic Republic', whose demise in 1989 was mourned by Murray as 'a historic setback for human progress', and in happier times, whose delights were savoured by Corbyn when he toured the Kremlin's bewalled colony on his motorbike with, so it is said, Diane Abbott riding pillion, or that of the 'People's Democratic Republic of Korea', which Murray declared his solidarity with as a leading member of the Communist Party? Be all that as it may, Murray's not so ex party announced that it would not, as in all previous contests, be running any candidates against the Corbynised Labour Party in the forthcoming General Election. Corbyn's election as Labour Leader was not only welcomed in the Kremlin, but in the Middle East (that is, bar Israel). Just like Galloway and Livingstone, who both endorsed Corbyn's leadership bid, from the beginning of the anti-Zionist left as an organised movement, Corbyn's interest in Middle Eastern affairs had led him to form associations with individuals, pressure groups, campaigns and internationally, regimes and movements, that were anything but left wing. This was because Corbyn's rise to prominence in the anti-Zionist movement coincided with the emergence of theocratic jihadism in the Middle East, a development that required an accommodation with their increasingly more active Muslim offshoots in the UK.

Corbyn's rise to prominence in the anti-Zionist cause began when he was elected as a Labour MP for Islington North in 1983. He then teamed up with two other anti-Zionist Labourites who were at that time closely associated with Gerry Healy's Gaddafi-funded Workers Revolutionary Party; GLC Leader Ken Livingstone, and WRP veteran Ted Knight (whom I knew personally when, back in the 1960s, we were both leading members of the WRP's forerunner, the Socialist Labour League.) From 1983 to 1986, Knight, then Leader of Lambeth Council, together with Livingstone, Leader of the Greater London Council from 1981 to 1986, whom Corbyn chose as his defence adviser when elected Labour Leader in 2015, and John McDonnell, Greater London Councillor from 1981 to 1987 and Labour MP from 1997, and from 2015 to 2020, Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, edited *Labour Herald*, a Gaddafi - financed weekly publication printed on the WRP's printing press, Astmoor Litho. *Labour Herald*, like the WRP's daily *Newsline*, (also bank-rolled by Gaddafi) regularly carried features attacking Israel, one being a review of three books which alleged that the Zionist movement had collaborated with the Nazis in the Holocaust in order to exploit the deaths of its victims to gain sympathy for a Jewish state in Palestine. Israel, claimed the reviewer, Harry Mullin, 'is a state built on the blood of Europe's Jews, whom the Zionists deserted in their hour of greatest need'. Over time, as we have

seen, this became the standard left-wing version of Holocaust revisionism. A year later came the publication of another revisionist work, Lenni Brunner's *Zionism in the Age of Dictators*, the book which served as the source of Livingstone's oft-repeated claim that Hitler 'supported Zionism'. Not long after writing his review, Mullin found a new outlet for his anti-Semitism by making a natural progression from the insidious Jew-baiting of *Labour Herald* to the uninhibited version promoted by the Neo-Nazi British National Party, where he was free to promote the orthodox Holocaust revisionist version that it never happened.

1983, the year that saw the launching *Labour Herald*, was also the year that Corbyn was first elected as Labour MP for Islington North. But this did not lead any weakening of his links with the Communist Party's tankies, or his commitment to the anti-Israel cause. Indeed, it was then that with Livingstone, he founded and sponsored the Labour Movement Campaign for Palestine (later, the Palestine Solidarity Campaign), the two aims of which were to make the case for the replacement of Israel by a secular Palestinian state, and to combat 'manifestations of Zionism' (sic) in the Labour Party. Thus he was one of a number of far-left sponsors of a motion adopted at a meeting on May, 19, 1984, which launched a campaign to 'disaffiliate Poale Zion [now the Jewish Labour Movement] from the Labour Party', of which it had been a part since 1920. (Corbyn could always be relied upon to either move or sponsor any motion that smacked of anti-Zionism, as he did in the House of Commons on January 27, 2011, Holocaust Memorial Day, when with McDonnell, he moved a motion to change it to Genocide Memorial Day, thus in effect divesting it of its specific and unique Jewish significance.) The resolution that called for the disaffiliation of Poale Zion from the Labour party also initiated a similarly motivated campaign to 'break all links with [the Israel trade union movement] Histadrut', demanding that 'the Trades Union Congress and its affiliate unions' should 'reconsider the nature of Histadrut and their links with this body'. In both cases, the 'nature' at issue was that both organisations were Jewish, though in the case of Histadrut, it also enrolled Arab members.

When later confronted with the rise in the Middle East of decidedly non-secular Islamic jihadism, as represented by such movements as Islamic *Jihad*, Hezbollah, the Muslim Brotherhood and its Hamas offshoot, Corbyn and Livingstone made the necessary theological adjustments. With Allah now in the driving seat, there was no more talk of a 'secular Palestinian state', code for one ruled by Arafat's quasi-secular PLO. With a perfect sense of timing, only six months before the attack on the World Trade Centre, Corbyn voted in Parliament against a bill banning Al-Qaeda, the movement that carried out the atrocity, along with a number of other overtly Islamic terrorist organisations including Hamas and Hezbollah, both of which were then and are now committed to the destruction of Israel and the extermination of world Jewry, and which Corbyn was later to describe as his 'friends'. Corbyn was one of 17 Labour MPs who voted against the measure, together with two future members of his shadow cabinet, Diane Abbott and John McDonnell. And, as one would expect, it was Islam in its other manifestations which in addition to Palestine, also served as the prime focus for a number of Corbyn's other extra-Parliamentary activities. (In view of his friendship with and praise for Hamas, one must ask the question, had Corbyn taken the trouble to read the 1988 Hamas Covenant, with its unambiguous call for the elimination of the state of Israel and the genocide of all the Jews on the planet, and, also emulating Hitler, its citation of the *Protocols* as proof of a world Zionist conspiracy?)

Ten days after 9/11, in anticipation of a US-led military operation to remove the Taliban from power in Afghanistan, Corbyn helped to found and then chaired the Stop the War Coalition, which then in 2003 organised opposition to a similar military campaign to remove the genocidal Saddam regime in Iraq. In the same year, writing in the *Morning Star*, Corbyn endorsed the allegation of conspiracy theorists that 9/11 had been 'manipulated': 'After September 11, the claims that bin Laden and al-Qaeda had made the atrocity were quickly and loudly made. This was turned into an attack on the Taliban and then, subtly, into regime change in Afghanistan.' Corbyn obviously wanted the murderous Taliban theocracy to remain in power. But his statement also begged the question...if it wasn't bin Laden, who was it? Another of Corbyn's anti-Semitic 'friends', Sheikh Raed Salah, believed he had the answer: 'A suitable way was found to warn the 4,000 [sic] Jews who work in the Twin Towers to absent themselves from their work on September 11.'

With Corbyn acting as the link, the Coalition was the product of a coming together of two hitherto antagonistic branches of Bolshevism; Trotskyism as represented (rather badly I would submit) by the Socialist Workers Party, which refused to condemn the al-Qaeda attack on the World Trade Centre, and Stalinism, by Communist Party veteran and first Coalition Chairman Andrew Murray, and also by Vice-President Kamil Majid, also founder no less of the British Stalin Society. But the Islamic interest was also present and well-catered for from the very beginning. In April 2002, Corbyn, along with Saddam stooge George Galloway and Tony Benn, addressed an anti-Zionist rally in Trafalgar Square convened by the British arm of the theocratic Muslim Brotherhood affiliate, the Muslim Association of Britain.

With his patronage and frequent appearances on the platform at rallies of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, no one could doubt Corbyn's commitment to the Jihadi cause. And on February 12, 2006, we find him again addressing a Trafalgar Square rally, this time called by the Muslim Council of Britain and supported from the anti-Zionist left by London Mayor Ken Livingstone and the Socialist Workers Party, and from heaven by a number of Christian groups, to protest against cartoons published by the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* on September 30, 2005. Corbyn's presence at the meeting could only have meant that like the rest of the 5,000 protesters in attendance, he was opposed to a free press, especially when that freedom allowed criticism and satirisation of religion (and even more so, one suspects, when that religion was Islam). How else interpret his declaration to the meeting that 'we demand that people show respect for each other's community, each other's faith and [sic?] each other's religion'. The reader will have already learned just how much 'respect' Islam has for the followers of all other faiths, not to speak of those with none. As for Corbyn's injunction, when enunciating a categorical precept such as this, it is not unreasonable to expect that those doing so should set an example by always obeying it themselves.

Yet this is exactly what Corbyn on one well-advertised occasion lamentably failed to do. Not being a Catholic, in September 2017, he was taken to task by Clare Bowskill of the Latin Mass Society for receiving Holy Communion in a Catholic church: 'Most Catholics would consider that was disrespecting the faith quite considerably.' Yet he had said, this was a respect 'we demand'. The on-line *Oxford Dictionary* defines 'demand' as an 'insistent and peremptory request made *as of right*'. (My emphasis) By what right? Certainly not the intrinsic natural rights of man invoked by the Enlightenment, one of which, arguably the most fundamental,

was freedom of thought and expression. And no less to the point, in whose name? Who precisely was this 'we', outside of the 5,000 or so attending the meeting? In Islamic countries, clerics do indeed have the right to demand a great deal of those who come under their sway, especially when it comes to showing respect for Islam. In no fewer than 13 Islamic states (including to the one that with good reason, whatever Islamophiles say to the contrary, went by that name) apostasy is punishable by death, and blasphemy in 11, as Sharia law requires in both cases. And in the infidel world, terrorism is used against those who fail to comply with its dictates, as in the *fatwa* death sentence on Salman Rushdie, and the murder of the staff of *Charlie Hebdo* and Theo van Gogh, the maker of film *Fitnah* (submission) about the oppression women under Islam. But as an MP, Corbyn surely knew that in the UK, the only institutions that have the legal right to 'demand' anything of anyone as of right are those so empowered by an Act of Parliament.

What Corbyn was therefore 'demanding' were state-imposed restrictions on what anyone could say in public about religion in general and, we can be sure, Islam in particular. However, since Christianity was then still protected by the Blasphemy Laws (they were repealed, though only in England and Wales, despite concerted opposition by the clerical establishment, in 2008) Corbyn's demand for 'respect' for all religions was a cloak for the concerted drive by Muslim pressure groups to legally silence all criticism of just one - Islam. (This policy was taken up by Labour leader Ed Miliband in the course of his campaign for the General Election of May 2015, when he promised in an interview with the editor of a Muslim journal that if elected, he would introduce sweeping new laws to criminalise an undefined 'Islamophobia'. See Chapter 28.) 'Showing respect' so far as Islam goes is strictly a one-way street, and as we have already seen, the direst punishments can befall those who do not share it. Corbyn's demagogic demand for 'respect' for religion has an intriguing provenance, one that had they known of it, might have appealed to some among his largely Muslim audience. On October 4, 1933, in order to placate the leaders of Germany's Catholic and Protestant Churches who, with few honourable exceptions, were broadly in agreement with many of Hitler's policies, the Nazi regime included in its press law of that date a provision that obliged newspapers to publish nothing that might 'injure the religious sensibilities of others'. Had this Nazi law been in force in Denmark in September 2005, there would have been no need for a Trafalgar Square protest on February 12, 2006.

Quite aside from its dubious, to say the least, precedent, Corbyn's demand for a curb on what can be said about religion was shot through with internal contradictions and false assumptions. Firstly, we have a self-styled quasi-Marxist who was evidently, judging by his comments on the subject, either totally unaware of or fundamentally disagreed with Marx's famous but now in far-leftist circles *verboten* dictum that 'the criticism of religion', which he described as 'the opium of the people', is 'the pre-requisite of all criticism'. Secondly, what did Corbyn mean by 'each other's religion'? Millions of people in the UK have no religion, so, as far as they are concerned, there is no 'each other's'. With a 2019 survey suggesting that 53% of the UK population had no religious belief, confirmed by the 2021 census, how could Corbyn (like Hilary Clinton) make the assumption that everyone has a religion that needs respecting? Could it have been because he spent so much of his time in the company of devout Muslims? But more to the point, by what right can it be 'demanded' of people that they show respect for something they do not respect? If his 'demand' were to have had acquired the force of law, (if not, why

the rally?) it would have resulted in a state-imposed conformism hitherto the monopoly of totalitarian and theocratic regimes of the kind admired by Corbyn, as in the cases of Cuba and Iran. And why only respect for faiths? If respect can be demanded for religious beliefs, why not for political doctrines, for example Nazism or Stalinism? Why the 'privileging' of the religious over the secular? And finally, how did Corbyn intend to ensure that his 'demand' would be made effective? One can ban publications and websites that do not show the respect for religion required of them, that is true, and that seems to be what he and his Muslim and SWP friends desired, for why else protest at the publication and recycling of the Danish cartoons? But outlawing manifestations of disrespect does not generate respect. Quite the contrary in fact, as the surge in sales for banned books has proven time and again. But for all that, by siding so openly with the demand for a Islamic respect police, Corbyn had shown where his sympathies and priorities lay so far as freedom of expression was concerned, as he did in the wake of the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre. On February 12, 2015, he spoke at public meeting in London called by the Stop the War Coalition to protest, not against a terrorist atrocity that murdered journalists for exercising their right to satirise a religion, but 'Islamophobia and the War on Terror'. (The latter is not a misprint.)

What of Corbyn's partner of three decades and more in matters Sharia, the anti-Semitic Holocaust revisionist Ken Livingstone? Running as an independent, in 2000 he became the first elected mayor of London, and in that capacity, in 2004 played host at City Hall to a press conference sponsored by the Muslim Association of Britain. Its purpose was to provide a platform for the Muslim Brotherhood scholar Sheikh Yusef al-Qaradawi, who had been criticised for his support for Hamas suicide bombings of Israeli civilians, and his subsequent praise for Hitler's extermination of the Jews. (See Appendix T) Introduced by Livingstone as his 'honoured guest', when challenged by journalists to justify the indiscriminate murder of Jewish civilians by those Corbyn would in 2009 describe as his 'friends', Qaradawi's interpreter did not fully translate his reply from the Arabic. What he left out was Qaradawi's explanation for why he did not regard Israeli women as civilians. 'Their women are not like our women', because Israeli women serve in the Israeli army, and were therefore fair game. Islamic clerics like Qaradawi did not have a monopoly on support for suicide bombing. In 2001, (the seminal year for the rise of the Sharia left) the once-Marxist *New Left Review* carried an article which described the tactic as 'the ultimate weapon of the weak against the powerful of this earth'...like Jewish school children on a bus.

MPs reconciled to or, as Corbyn certainly did, revelling in a life-time on the backbenches, can engage in all manner of activities and say things which attract little if any media scrutiny, and concern the public even less, unless it happens to be their own MP. Such was Corbyn's comment, one of many in the same genre, when, following the killing of the architect of 9/11, Bin Laden, by US special forces, Corbyn appeared on Iranian Press TV to deplore his death as a 'tragedy'. At the time, he could never have anticipated that once thrust into the limelight by his totally unexpected emergence as the front runner in Labour's leadership contest, these and other similar indiscretions would come back to haunt him. However, this did not dent his core support in the election, at least half of which, a survey revealed, like Corbyn identified the USA, and not Jihadi Islam or Putin's Russia as the main threat to world peace. Other surveys at that time had shown that it was a different matter with the majority of Labour voters, and even more so with the public as a whole.

As a back-bench MP from 1983, Corbyn was able to find the time over the following years and decades to hire himself out as a useful idiot to a number of terrorist movements, including not only those dedicated to the destruction of Israel but to British rule in Northern Ireland, in this respect as in several others, emulating his long-time friend, comrade and fellow anti-Semite Ken Livingstone, and Labour and later Respect MP George Galloway. Post 9/11, and with the Irish question no longer a burning issue, Corbyn focused his attention and time on the public promotion of all manner of Islamic causes, and in doing so, drew close to two anti-Semitic terrorist movements, Hamas and Hezbollah. In 2012, he spoke at a Ramadan celebration together with the Salafist convert preacher Abdur Raheem Green, who had publicly accused Jews of giving off a 'Yehudi stench', advocated, as indeed all Muslim preachers should, the beating of wives to 'bring them to goodness', and of course the killing of gays and adulterers. Strange company for a man of the left.

Again, like fellow Sharia leftists Livingstone and Galloway, from 2009 to 2012, Corbyn had been paid at the rate of £1,250 per hour for appearing on Iranian Press TV, endorsing a boycott of Israel on behalf of a regime that puts into practice what Green preached. In March 2009, Corbyn announced to an 'anti-war' rally that he had invited to a Parliamentary event the next day representatives of Hamas and Hezbollah, both being well-armed Jihadi organisations that made no secret of their goal of destroying Israel and exterminating all its Jews. It was then, justifying his invitation, that Corbyn described the representatives of these two genocidal movements as 'friends' who were 'dedicated to the good of the Palestinian people and bringing about long-term peace and social and political justice'. It was, he said, both a 'pleasure and honour' to be host to such guests. Labelling such movements as Hamas and Hezbollah as terrorists was 'a big, big, historical mistake'. Either Corbyn had indeed never take the trouble to read the Hamas Covenant, whose policies were the total negation of those he ascribed to its authors, or he had, and for tactical reasons he chose to dissemble about its ultra-reactionary theocratic principles, genocidal objectives and terrorist methods. Or just maybe, useful idiot that was, he really did believe that Hamas was what he called it, a movement working for 'long-term peace [once Israel had been eliminated and all its Jews killed] and social and political justice'. Speaking on the same platform with Corbyn at the March 2009 rally was the Lebanese Muslim, Dyab Abou Jahjah. He had never disguised his support for *Jihad* against the west, telling a Flemish magazine that he considered 'every dead American, British and Dutch soldier a victory', presumably for Islam. His views on Israel were no less forthright, with his endorsement of what he called a 'one-state solution'. When asked by a BBC interviewer whether he had any recollection of meeting Abou Jahjah, Corbyn initially claimed that he had no idea who he was. Confronted with irrefutable proof to the contrary, namely a photograph of himself sitting on the platform next to Abou Jahjah at their Westminster event, Corbyn's lame excuse was that he 'met thousands of people'. Possibly...but with how many of them did he share a speaker's platform at two anti-Israel events on successive days? Nor was this all, Far from it. Despite supposedly not knowing him, and yet obviously fully appraised of Abou Jahjah's controversial views, Corbyn went to some considerable lengths to ensure that he would be able to speak at the two scheduled events, lobbying Labour's Home Secretary, Jacqui Smith, to as he put it, 'use government influence' to secure clearance for his guest to enter the country. But all Corbyn could say when asked if

he knew his Lebanese guest, was, 'Sorry...who? who is he?' (The same Home Office Minister who waved through Corbyn's pro-Jihadi guest had earlier that same year denied entry to Dutch MP Geert Wilders, who at the request of a House of Lords peer, had been invited to the UK to show his film *Fitna* highlighting the Jihadist message of Islam promoted by Corbyn's guest.) It seems Abou Jahjah was none too pleased with Corbyn's vain attempt to disown him, commenting acidly on Twitter that 'whatever reasons made Mr [sic] Corbyn say this are for him to know and for us to guess.' That they shared a platform was 'beyond any doubt and is documented' and what is more, 'resulted in my ban to enter the UK', adding sarcastically, 'maybe he forgot about it. Who knows?' Whatever Abou Jahjah said at the meetings to get himself banned, it must have been pretty strong meat. Strange that Corbyn had no recollection of it. But it was not just two encounters at two meetings. Abou Jahjah insisted that 'we had, I think two times, lunch or breakfast together.' While he could not say Corbyn was 'a personal friend', he was 'absolutely a political friend'. But 'Mr Corbyn' had never heard of him! So it was either a case of a highly selective memory or a barefaced lie.

Corbyn always justified the associations he did remember or admit to as being for the 'the good of the Palestinian people'. This of course depended on how one in this context defines what is meant by 'good'. What 'good' had the goal of eliminating Israel and killing its entire Jewish population, objectives of his 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah that Corbyn must surely have been aware of, brought to the Palestinians? That his guests excluded as matter of principle a negotiated two-state solution to the Palestinian question, and remain dedicated to completing the Nazis' 'final solution of the Jewish question', obviously did not trouble him in the least. Strange company for a man of the left.

In 2011, Corbyn again played host, this time to the Hamas founder Raed Salah. One of Salah's claims to fame was being among the first to put into circulation the *canard* that all the World Trade Centre's Jewish employees (whom he numbered at 4,000!) stayed at home on the morning of 9/11. Another was repeating yet again the ancient Christian myth that the children of Europe had their 'blood mixed with the dough of the Jewish holy bread'. Comments such as this also had him banned from visiting the UK. That made two for Corbyn. He did pick them. True jihadi that he was, in 2011, Salah entered the UK illegally to spread his message of hate against the Jews and the West, again at the invitation of Corbyn, only to be arrested and ordered to be deported on the grounds of his anti-Semitism.

Like the sayings and doings of his other anti-Semitic friends and associates, none of this seemed to have remotely troubled Corbyn or those who twice voted for him to become the leader of the Labour Party. His supporters insisted that although possibly having associates who were anti-Semitic, he was himself definitely not one, the proof being that he said so. Indeed, I have been personally assured by one of his many star-struck admirers that this was indeed the case. Be that as it may, in 2012, Corbyn was seen on Al Jazeera TV not only praising this same pathological anti-Semite as a 'very honoured citizen' who 'represents his people very well', possessing 'a voice that must be heard', but also, despite the ban, yet again inviting him back to the UK! 'I hereby renew [sic] my invitation to Sheikh Salah to come to Parliament, to meet with me, meet with my colleagues. He will be assured of a very warm welcome. I look forward to giving you tea on the [House of Commons] terrace because you deserve it.' Had Corbyn succeeded in smuggling the banned hate preacher once more into the UK, Salah could have entertained Corbyn and his

fellow tea drinkers on the House of Commons terrace by describing once again how Jews mix the blood of murdered Christian children with their Passover unleavened bread, and by repeating what he wrote after 9/11 in article for *Sawt al-Haq W'al-Huriyya*, the journal of Islamic Movement:

A suitable way was found to warn the 4,000 Jews who work every day in the Twin Towers to absent from their work on September 11, 2001, and this is what really happened. Were 4,000 Jewish clerks absent by chance, or was there another reason? At the same time, no such warning reached the 2,000 [sic!] Muslims who worked every day in the Twin Towers, and therefore there were hundreds of Muslim victims.

Just as Corbyn said, certainly 'a voice that must be heard'. And, moreover, one that shared Corbyn's conviction that 9/11 was 'manipulated'. Next we have yet another anti-Semitic Corbyn associate, Paul Eisen, a fanatical anti-Zionist and cohort of the ubiquitous Holocaust-denier, anti-Zionist, Hitler (and Corbyn) admirer and former KKK Grand Wizard, David Duke. Eisen's friendship with Corbyn went back some fifteen years, and had evidently not been disturbed by Eisen's Nazi connections and public repudiation of the Holocaust: 'I question whether there ever existed homicidal gas chambers...For my money, a child of six can see that something's not right about the Holocaust narrative. For me, "Holocaust Denier" is a label I accept.' He also accepted Corbyn's money. Eisen recalled how, at their first encounter, Corbyn's chequebook 'was already on the table' to contribute to his 'Deir Yassin Remembered', an anti-Zionist group so extreme in its anti-Semitism that it was publicly disowned even by the Sharia leftist Palestinian Solidarity Campaign in 2007. But not by its founder and Patron Corbyn, who stood by his (anti-Semitic) man, and continued as before to attend annual meetings of his anti-Zionist society. A friend indeed, says Eisen: 'During the time, I was marginalised, when the movement with which he was associated [the PSC] so despised me, Jeremy always said hello.' So Corbyn went behind the back of his own movement to continue befriending an anti-Semite who had been officially ostracised by it. Strange loyalty for someone the *Morning Star* described as having a 'long and honourable record of opposing fascism, racism and [sic] anti-Semitism'.

Corbyn again found himself in such company when, in his capacity as the Stop the War Coalition's useful idiot Chairman, on August 17, he addressed the 2012 London annual Iran-sponsored 'al-Quds Day' anti-Israeli rally. Displayed on the platform behind Corbyn could be clearly seen a large black Hezbollah banner dedicated to Ayatollah Khomeini, the founder of Iran's Islamic Republic, under whose ten years of clerical despotism thousands of leftists, secular democrats and Kurdish separatists were tortured and butchered, and the *fatwah* against Salman Rushdie promulgated. His revered successor, Ayatollah Khamenei was, like so many of Corbyn's associates, an avowed anti-Semite, one who denied the Holocaust, and who had, like Corbyn's 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah, vowed to 'wipe Israel off the map', a goal that did not sit easily with Corbyn's avowed self-appointed role as a peace-maker and the ostensible anti-war aims of his Coalition. But it did with former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's declaration that the objective of Quds Day was the 'annihilation' of the Zionist regime' and that on the day Corbyn addressed the London rally, back in Tehran, Quds Day demonstrators were chanting 'death to Israel'. In the same spirit, posters on view at

the rally addressed by Corbyn included one that proclaimed 'Israel your Days Are Numbered', and another, held by a child, which explained, in 1984-style Shariaspeak, that 'For World Peace Israel must be Destroyed'. A third, clutched by an even younger little girl fully-swathed in regulation Muslim rape-prevention costume, had a swastika superimposed on the star of David over the word 'Zionazi', and above it, the legend, 'Boycott Apartheid Israel'. Another poster accused Israel of 'genocide'. Unless he had the same problem with his eyesight as with his memory, Corbyn must have seen all these posters from his vantage point on the speaker's platform and on the march that preceded the meeting. A strange setting for a man of the left.

Corbyn, not only kept on good terms with Holocaust deniers, as we have seen with Raed Salah of Hamas and Paul Eisen, but also 9/11 deniers. When the Rev. Stephen Sizer found himself in hot water with the Bishop of Guildford over his on-line claim that Jews and not Muslims were behind the attack on the World Trade Centre, ('Israel did it') Corbyn came to his defence, complaining in a letter to Sizer's superiors that the Vicar was 'under attack by certain individuals intent on discrediting the excellent work [sic] he does in highlighting the injustices of the Palestinian situation', leaving one wondering just who these 'certain individuals' might be. The good Rev. was no stranger to Corbyn. They had shared the same platform at the Iran-sponsored 2012 annual Jew-baiting 'al-Quds Day' rally, just as they had done at numerous other anti-Israel events. As for Sizer's 'excellent work', in addition to re-cycling Jewish conspiracy theories, it included finding the time, in the midst of his parishional duties, to fraternize with anti-Semitic Hezbollah leaders, and promote the Sharia leftist 'Stop the War Coalition' (chaired by Corbyn) and Palestinian Solidarity Campaign (founder and Patron, Corbyn). In recognition of his services to the anti-Zionist cause, the Winter 2014 number of the PSC's on-line newsletter, *Palestine News*, came to the Rev. Sizer's defence, describing what were well-founded accusations of his anti-Semitism as a 'witch-hunt'. Corbyn's support for the embattled Vicar was joined by others of a like mind, with one anti-Zionist website claiming that Sizer was a 'truth seeker' who had been 'silenced by Israel's stooges'.

Some might find a little odd that while the Reverend Sizer was able to find the time and energy to wage his vendetta against the Jews, the desperate plight of his fellow Christians in the Islamic world, who were being hounded, tormented, gang-raped, forcibly converted and murdered by the thousand in the Middle East and beyond, was clearly not his prime concern in matters beyond his parishional responsibilities. Evidently there were more pressing causes for a man of the cloth. As the saying goes, one must always see the bigger picture. Again, strange company for a man of the left. However, not the PSC, but Sizer's own church had the last word. After having been suspended in 2018 from all church duties for repeated comments that were deemed anti-Semitic, in December 2022, an unprecedented Church of England public tribunal charged him with no fewer than eleven counts of anti-Semitism, including appearing on a PSC platform (as had Corbyn) with a known Holocaust denier, conduct, said the Tribunal, 'unbecoming of a church minister'. (One could also say the same of Corbyn, for a Labour MP and Leader.) On January 30, 2023, despite (or, more likely, because of his) his 'excellent work' in the anti-Zionist cause, Corbyn's comrade in arms was defrocked after being found guilty on four charges of anti-Semitism, and banned from preaching for the next ten years. But not from speaking on behalf of the

cause closest to his heart, because he was back again in March 2023, addressing the annual anti-Israel London al Quds rally.

As a candidate hoping to be elected to the leadership of one of the UK's two major political parties, even someone of Corbyn's limited intelligence would have realised he had to appeal to a far broader constituency than Holocaust deniers and Jewish conspiracy theorists such as his friends Sizer and Eisen. Consequently, none of these associations, or the causes they represented, featured in Corbyn's leadership election manifesto, which was devoted almost entirely to domestic issues, which throughout his career, had always take second place to issues and events abroad. This omission, however astute, was far less than honest, because once elected, his prior commitments quickly reasserted themselves. This should have surprised no one familiar with his political provenance.

Inevitably, Corbyn's many years of high-profile campaigning alongside and on behalf of anti-Semites, anti-Zionist Jihadis, Islamic clerics and Holocaust deniers had given rise to questions about his own attitude towards the Jews. The manner in which he responded to them was not to everyone's satisfaction. For example, when criticised for sharing a platform at the London Stop the War Coalition rally with Holocaust denier Dyab Abou Jahjah, he evaded the issue by replying that he 'refused to be dragged into this stuff [sic] that somehow or other because we are pro-Palestinian, we're anti-Semitic'. No one had said that being pro-Palestinian was proof of anti-Semitism. It was Corbyn's track record of associations and collaboration with pro-Palestinians who *were* anti-Semitic that was the problem. (See Appendix T: *Jeremy and the Jew-Baiters*) Then there was Corbyn's own attitude towards the Holocaust to consider. Like so many on the left, he saw the need to as it were, cut it down to size, even to 'deJudaify' it, one suspects to counter what many on the far left claim to be a Zionist plot to exploit the Holocaust to justify the existence of the state of Israel. As we have seen, some anti-Semites had gone as far as to claim that the Zionist leadership actually collaborated with the Nazis in murdering (anti-Zionist) Jews, precisely in order to generate sympathy for the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. Corbyn, whose jihadi 'friends' had made no secret of their intention to complete the genocide of the Jews that Hitler went more than half-way to achieving, offered this comment on the Holocaust, whose purpose was clearly designed to 'relativise' what was for those historians who have faithfully recorded it, the greatest crime in human history: 'Why is the slave trade not remembered in the same breath [as the Holocaust] or the genocide of native Americans by the European armies and settlers who came to grab land and wealth using their advantage of technology and weaponry?' While equating the Holocaust with crimes committed by colonising Europeans, he made no reference to the equally barbaric conduct of Muslim colonists, with slavery, including sexual, specifically sanctified by the *Koran* (33:50, 23:5,6, 4:24, 8:69, 24:32) and practised on a no less vast a scale for nearly a thousand years before the transatlantic Christian version was under way, and which continues in Africa to this day, long after it was abolished in the civilised world. Aside from the difficulty of remembering with one's lungs (perhaps this explained Corbyn's memory lapses and why he sometimes struggled to comprehend the most elementary concepts) the answer to Corbyn's question is obvious, so much so that it takes a simpleton not to see it. Treating the Holocaust as uniquely evil (which for Corbyn it evidently was not), has nothing to do with an implied Zionist perversion of history or, for that matter, any intention to minimise the evils of Western slavery. By the same token,

no-one would expect, or should demand, that in 'remembering' the slave trade (the Islamic as well as the Christian), reference should always be made 'in the same breath' to the Holocaust, and that if this was not done, claim the omission was in some way an attempt to belittle its horrors.

This 'relativising' of the Holocaust engaged in by the anti-Zionist left first emerged as a trend amongst post-war German historians *of the right*, most notably Ernst Nolte, but now, like so much else that that was once its preserve, it has migrated to the far left. How else explain that, for example, Corbyn's support for a motion in Parliament on Holocaust Memorial Day January 27, 2011, calling for it to be divested of its uniquely Jewish nature and replaced by a *Genocide* Memorial Day, one applicable also to a mythical Israeli genocide of the Palestinians? Perhaps in his zeal to promote the anti-Zionist cause, he had forgotten that two years previously, in the same building, he had described as his 'friends' the terrorist Hamas movement, one of whose aims, as specified in its already cited Covenant article seven, conformed exactly to the United Nations definition of genocide, namely, 'killing members of the group [in this case, the Jews] 'with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.' There are good grounds for suspecting that Corbyn's motion was intended to appease fellow anti-Zionists who, like himself, accused Israel of the genocide of the Palestinians, a charge that Corbyn personally endorsed when he signed the Cairo Declaration of December 18-19, 2002, which, twice in its text made that very same allegation.

Some black politicians and historians have been tempted to go down the same path as Corbyn, though not by inventing a genocide, but by redefining what the word means. US political activist Rev. Jesse Jackson, who in 1984 notoriously referred to New York as 'Hymietown', declared himself to be 'sick and tired of hearing about the Holocaust', and chose the occasion of a visit to Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial to point out that 'in all, the Nazis killed more non-Jews than Jews' (none of whom, apart from gypsies, were of races the Nazis sought to exterminate), adding for good measure the debatable, to say the least, claim that '60 million blacks had been exterminated during the slavery era'. In an interview with *Haaretz*, the Israeli leftist weekly, the black historian Marcus Redeker, author of *The Slave Ship: A Human History*, argued that there had been an 'African Holocaust', while conceding that whereas all the Jews were marked down for extermination, 'the point of the slave trade was not to kill people [*pace* Jackson], but to get as many living bodies to the New World in order to use them to make money.' That is not what the word 'Holocaust' implies, or, as with 'genocide', means, which is to *deliberately* seek to exterminate a certain racial or ethnic group, as was the case with the Jews, not to cause deaths that unintentionally result from enslaving it for the purpose of economic gain. Even so, Redeker's comment cannot be reconciled with Jackson's claim of 60 million 'exterminated' blacks.

The Corbynista rise in the Labour Party demonstrated that anti-Semitism can suddenly surface in places where one would have once least expected it. A poll, conducted in March 2017, found that 80%, yes, 80% of Labour Party members believed that accusations of anti-Semitism made against the party were designed to discredit its leader and stifle criticism of Israel, while 65% considered the Jewish state to be a 'force for bad' a percentage considerably higher than that recorded in the same poll for Corbyn's Press TV employer between 2009 and 2012, Iran, which amongst its many other vile practices, was at that time responsible for half the

world's recorded executions. A survey of UK attitudes towards the Jews conducted in 2015 found that around 40% of respondents harboured anti-Semitic prejudices of one kind or another, many of whom, with this large percentage, would have described themselves as left wing. This was confirmed by a survey conducted by the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism, which found that the more left interviewees placed themselves on the political spectrum, the more likely they were to be anti-Semitic.

Given that most British Jews were likely to be considerably more aware of Corbyn's close relationship with Iran and Islamic terrorists, and hostility towards Israel, than the general public, is it then surprising that in a 2017 survey by YouGov, 83% of Jews condemned the Labour Party for its leniency towards anti-Semitism within its own ranks? Possibly with the prospect of a Corbynista government as one of the factors contributing to their concerns, one third of those Jews interviewed said they were considering emigrating from the UK. (One of the reasons why prejudice against Jews is so hard to combat is that it does not acknowledge its own existence. Those who subscribe to bigoted ideas regard them as perfectly normal in so far as they share them with associates of a like mind. This is especially so with anti-Semitism, as it almost always assumes, especially on the left, the guise of a now socially acceptable anti-Zionism.)

Corbyn's more than three decades of single-minded commitment to anti-Zionism extended beyond speech-making, hosting anti-Semitic terrorists and heading various anti-Zionist campaigns. In addition to his literary contributions, it even included, on one occasion, what some might see as justifying criminal violence. In January 2009, during clashes between Hamas and Israel, a Stop the War Coalition rally in support of Hamas outside the Israel embassy degenerated into violence on a scale reminiscent of a Tsarist pogrom. Shops were damaged and looted, and a Starbucks vandalised as retribution for the company's alleged Jewish links with Israel. The scale and level of violence was such that *more than fifty* police officers were injured in the attempt to restore order. Many of those arrested, out of total of more than one hundred, were young Muslim men, some of whom were subsequently convicted, with around 20 receiving prison sentences, for various offences committed during the riot. Corbyn, at the time Chairman of the organisation that had staged the protest, one ostensibly dedicated to stopping violence, not providing a vehicle for it, was outraged. While not denying that the violence and destruction had occurred, he excused it. 'People get angry, and the events [sic!] that happened at the end of the demonstration were an expression of anger about what was happening in Gaza...young people have been put into prison sentences essentially [sic] for attending [sic] a demonstration.' Could Corbyn really be so obtuse as to believe what he was saying? They had not been jailed for 'attending' a demonstration. Their hatred of Jews had led them to commit crimes of violence against property and against the police and had paid the penalty that the law of the land required.

As with this demonstration, most of Corbyn's pre-occupations as a back-bench MP had to do with foreign policy issues, or, closer to home, 'the troubles' in Northern Ireland, where he became an apologist for IRA terrorism. In so far as Corbyn had anything that could be described as a consistent foreign policy, it proceeded on the basis of the well-worn but hazardous formula, the enemy of my enemy is my friend. Israel, along with the USA, was of course the main enemy, which made Hezbollah and Hamas his friends, just as NATO did Russia. Indeed,

as we have seen, on one occasion, Corbyn explicitly refereed to the two terrorist movements as his 'friends'. He even declared his support for what he called a 'political solution' to the emergence of the Islamic State, which necessarily would have involved some kind of recognition of its legitimacy, firstly to conduct negotiations with its Caliph, and secondly, for the 'solution' to be 'political', not theological. Finally, and perhaps this aspect of his proposal was never given serious thought (serious thought not being one of Corbyn's strongest suits) it takes two to negotiate, and negotiators need to speak the same political language and each to be prepared to make concessions to the other party. What concessions did Corbyn think should have been made to the Islamic State, illegally occupying and terrorising swathes of territory of two sovereign states, Syria and Iraq, so as to further what he called a 'peace process'? Even after the ISIS massacres in Paris on November 13, 2015, he continued to oppose any military action against the Islamic State. He did not think that 'bombing is necessarily going to bring about the solution that they think it might' and predicted that 'there's going to be civilian casualties from the bombing of [the Islamic State capital] Raqqa' This was true. But French President Hollande's intention, unlike the assassins of November 13, was not to deliberately kill civilians, but to strike back at those who were. Unlike most 'peace campaigners', who in a military conflict, say a plague on all houses, irrespective of their relative merits and motives, Corbyn did see the difference between the lesser and the greater evil. The problem was, he always seemed to prefer the greater.

Throughout his political career, Corbyn's much-advertised advocacy of peace was as ineffective as it was selective, having had no impact whatsoever on any of the world's military conflicts, or success in persuading his terrorist friends to abandon their goal of destroying the state of Israel, if indeed that was his intention. Corbyn's 'peace campaigning', like that of its forerunner, the Kremlin-controlled 'British peace Committee, was directed exclusively against what he considered to be the greater, if not the sole evil in the world, the West, for example, describing the US conduct in the war against the Saddam regime as 'appalling' as that of the Islamic State, while never condemning in the same language atrocities committed by Islamic movements against Israeli civilians. Had Corbyn not seen any of the promotional videos the Islamic State sent around the world, depicting the most horrific scenes of decapitations, crucifixions, burials and burnings alive, stonings, immersions in nitric acid baths and mass executions? Did he really believe that this was no worse than the conduct of the US forces in Iraq? One suspects that what Corbyn really found objectionable, though of course he did not say so, was not the behaviour of the US armed forces, but the fact that for all the protests of his Sharia left 'Stop the War Coalition', the US and its allies removed from power the fascist and genocidal regime of Saddam Hussein. Corbyn thought that this action called for an apology, which he promised to give should he become Prime Minister. To be consistent he should also demand that the Western Allies (Stalin's forces one assumes would be exempt) apologise for the civilian casualties they caused in defeating the Axis powers in the Second World War.

Corbyn also believed that it was the West that was exclusively to blame for all the deaths and destruction that ensued during and after the removal of Saddam from power in 2003. This was yet another Corbyn lie. Iraqi civilian deaths caused by the invasion forces were dwarfed by the subsequent waves of slaughter unleashed by Iraqi Sunnis on Shi'as, which were then massively augmented, following the emergence of ISIS in 2014, by the forces of the (also Sunni) Islamic State. Corbyn

not only had problems with his memory, but in finding facts to substantiate his assertions. In 2003, the year of the US-led invasion of Iraq, the number of civilian deaths recorded by the post Saddam Iraqi authorities was 12,125. It is perfectly reasonable to conclude that some of these were caused not only by Saddam's forces, but also, inadvertently, by the actions of the invading armies.

While it is true that they would not have occurred had there been no invasion, had Saddam remained in power, the number of deaths directly attributable to his own repressive regime, already in the hundreds of thousands, would have continued to rise. (See Addendum to Appendix T) But after his removal, the picture changes. As the years went by, conflicts between the US-led coalition forces and the remnants of the Saddam regime gave way to a recrudescence of the age-old civil war within Islam between the once favoured by Saddam, but now displaced Sunni minority in the north, and the now-dominant Shi'a majority in the centre and south. Civilian casualties, caused mainly by Sunni terrorists, soared far above the level of the 2003 invasion, reaching 29,441 in 2006 and 26,036 in 2007. A so-called 'surge' by the US forces curbed, but did not eliminate the carnage, which dipped to its lowest point in 2011, with 4,153 civilian deaths. Then, as the US and its allies completed their withdrawal, delegating security responsibilities to the Iraqis, so the so-called 'sectarian' slaughter began to escalate again, according to a UN report, reaching 19,000 between January 2014 and October 2015, proving that this was not, as the far left claimed, a war of 'resistance' against 'western imperialism', but the resumption of an ancient war of religion between Muslims, which the presence of western forces, far from being its cause, had held in check. The figures for deaths caused by suicide bombings, directed, not against the US military, but fellow Muslims, tell the same story. The daily rate of deaths caused by 'martyrdom operations' stood at 1.5 in the year of the invasion. By 2007, it had risen to 22, that is, 22 per *day*. The death rate then dropped to an average of six per day, and then in 2013, just before the advent of ISIS, rose again to 10.

When Corbyn said he wished to apologise for this intra-Islamic carnage, he was attributing to military actions of the West in the 21st century the tragic consequences of a blood feud between Sunnis and Shi'as that began thirteen hundred years previously, one which neither party displayed any inclination to abandon. Evidently then, Corbyn's obsessional involvement with Muslim causes had taught him next to nothing about the history and nature of Islam. The Taliban's relentless killing of Afghan civilians was also awarded a free pass by Corbyn and Sharia left generally. The UN's Afghanistan Mission began monitoring civilian casualties in 2009. Following the departure, despite Afghan government requests that they stay, of all western combat forces in 2014, civilian casualties, as they did in Iraq, suddenly rose the next year to 3,500 deaths and 7,500 wounded, 61% of these being directly caused by the Taliban.

In addition to his embracing various Jihadi causes (including that of the IRA), Corbyn was a long-standing advocate of the UK's withdrawal from NATO and its abandonment of nuclear weapons. His election as Labour Leader was therefore music to the ears of the Kremlin, especially since Corbyn, for decades a CND activist and both its vice chair and president, had previously blamed the Ukrainian crisis on the West (see above), and not the imperial ambitions of former KGB operative Vladimir Putin who, in vintage Stalinist style, arranged the murder of anyone, both at home and abroad, whom he judged a threat to his rule. So in an article on the Ukraine for the 'Stop the War Coalition', far from seeking to stop

Putin's proxy war against the Ukraine in the Donbas, Corbyn accused NATO of 'an attempt to encircle Russia', no mean achievement, given the enormous length of Russia's borders (20,241 kilometres, mostly with states closely aligned with Moscow) and coast line (37,653 kilometres) the major part of which lies above the Arctic Circle. Has this geography dunce never seen a map of Russia? Did he not know that poor encircled Russia was not only by far the largest country in the world, but also possessed the world's largest nuclear arsenal and second largest army?

As Putin quite openly stepped up his logistic support for far-right Russian militias in eastern Ukraine, and with Corbyn still its Chairman, on February 22, 2015, the Stop the War Coalition joined with the Kremlin's puppet 'Solidarity with Ukraine' (sic!) to protest outside the US embassy against what their joint statement claimed was a 'US and NATO arming of the Kiev regime', (that is, Ukraine's legitimate and, unlike a number of 'regimes' supported by Corbyn, democratically-elected government), this being supposedly part of a larger plan 'to guard the strategic interests of the EU [sic] and the North American imperialist powers'. Putin of course, like his Soviet predecessors, had no 'strategic interests', only legitimate defensive ones. Labour MPs who accused Corbyn and his pro-Putin leadership staff of undermining the party's Remain campaign little more than a year later needed to look no further than this statement as to their motives.

Corbyn's apologia for Russian aggression in the Ukraine (See Appendix XIV), and his refusal to condemn its bombing operations in Syria, while opposing those by western powers against the Islamic State, suggested that when it came to wars and invasions, some needed to be endorsed and justified, not stopped. Intriguingly, in one of several policy overlaps, Corbyn's anti-Europeanism also coincided with that of Donald Trump's, who even as far back as 2000, argued that 'their [i.e., Europe's] conflicts are not worth American lives.' Also like Corbyn, Trump was a vehement critic of the US military interventions in Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein - 'possibly the worst decision that has been made in the history of our country' - and in Afghanistan against the Taliban, 'we made a terrible mistake getting involved there in the first place', statements that surely qualified him for high office in the Corbynista Stop the War Coalition. Trump's opposition to the US-led removal of Saddam Hussein was not the only instance of right-wing opposition to the US-led operation. In the course of his investigation into far-right infiltration of the US armed forces, Matt Kennard in his *Irregular Army* discovered that

the American Neo-Nazi movement was for the most part virulently against the war in Iraq. Most of the groups hold to an updated conspiracy theory about Jewish power, which they call ZOG, or Zionist Occupation Government. It is premised on Western governments supposed submission to Jewish and Israeli power. [This claim is also promoted both on the far left and the Jihadi movements supported by it, in the first place Corbyn's 'friends', Hamas and Hezbollah.] On their internet forums, US soldiers are often greeted with incendiary comments about being "Jewish warriors" and "Zionist crusaders" for fighting in the War on Terror. ...Charles Wilson, spokesman for the National Socialist Movement, tells me the group is "150 per cent against the war in Iraq".

National KKK Director Pastor (sic) Thomas Robb told Kennard that 'we have opposed the war in Iraq since day one', while another Neo-Nazi, the US army veteran Forrest Fogarty, made it clear that while he fought in Iraq, he (like Corbyn) didn't 'believe in the War on terror. It was a war to protect Israel; I don't

think we need to be over there; I just went...I don't like it when people call me a warrior for Israel.' The Trump-Corbyn convergence was not confined to foreign policy, as Corbyn's Shadow Foreign Secretary, Emily Thornberry, readily conceded: 'To give him his credit...Donald Trump was talking about the importance of investing in jobs and infrastructure, and in the economies across the country, not just the main cities, and that's right'. As opponents of 'globalisation', both Trump and Corbyn rejected what the latter called 'free-trade dogma'. A Corbyn 'aide' also confirmed the Labour Leader's 'inner circle' had been, quote, 'inspired [sic!] by Trump's success in America'. In Corbyn's own words, 'the Leave and Trump campaigns succeeded because they both recognised the system [sic...a term much favoured by far-right populists] was broken and the people [and another] weren't being listened to.' Which 'people' did Corbyn have in mind?

And the populist similarities did not end there. There was also the not unimportant matter of their political style and strategy. Both Trump and Corbyn presented themselves as outsiders taking on their respective 'establishments' in Washington and Westminster, and railed against a supposed media conspiracy, one which in Corbyn's case, had allegedly assumed a Zionist character, with an Israeli veto over BBC coverage of the Middle East. Both had an undisguised admiration for 'strong men' opposed to the liberal democratic west. Both defied the odds and their critics by sweeping the board in internal contests for their party's leadership, and by so doing split them from top to bottom. Both generated a fanatical cult following unique in the modern history of their countries, one that stimulated a brisk trade in T-Shirts emblazoned with their saviour's name, and attracted support from the more unsavoury fringes of the political spectrum at home and abroad. Both were addicted to tweeting and media stunts and mobilised their own 'militias', Trump the 'Proud Boys' and a loose coalition of white supremacists, and Corbyn, Momentum. Both claimed they had been the victim of vast conspiracies, Trump that his 'landslide' victory in the 2020 Presidential election had been 'stolen' from him by Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, who died in 2013, and Corbyn that his defeat in the general election of 2019 was due to the unprecedented hostility of the UK media and the 'weaponising' of false charges of anti-Semitism. The convergence had been so striking, one commentator described it as Corbyn's 'Trumpification', while another referred to the Labour Leader as 'the Trump of the left'.

One important difference had been their performance at the polls. While Trump defied all the pundits by winning in 2016, (albeit with a minority of the votes cast), and again in 2024, Corbyn fell 64 seats short of an overall majority in the general election of 2017. Two years later, in council elections and for the EU Parliament, Labour's share of the vote plummeted to the lowest level in the party's entire history, followed in December of the same year by its worst general election result since 1935, when had still to recover from its crushing defeat in 1931. Another difference, which was related to the first, is that whereas Trump's support was broadly and firmly based in the Republican electorate, drawing with it, with varying degrees of conviction, a sizable number of Republican Senators and Representatives, Corbyn's stood on a much narrower foundation, no more than thirty or so MPs, re-activated constituency leftists, students, (mainly anti-Semitic) Muslims and far left entryists. A series of surveys established that the overwhelming majority of Labour voters, with the exception of Muslims, wanted no part of him.

To understand why Corbyn and those around him became so committed to their support of the oligarch-friendly Putin regime, it is necessary to locate this orientation in its historical and geo-political contexts. Beginning in Tsarist times, when the autocracy fought a series of wars against Ottoman Turkey, Russia has had long-standing strategic interests in the region, one of which was unimpeded access to the Mediterranean. These attempted incursions were always resisted by the western powers, most notably in the Crimean war in the mid-nineteenth century, in which Marx took the side of the West against what he called the 'dark Asiatic power' of Russia (See Appendix XIV). Turkey's alignment with Germany and Austria in the First World War of necessity brought a reversal of western policy in the so-called 'Near East', presenting Russian Pan Slavists with the opportunity to re-assert their claim to Constantinople as one of their war aims, one which only lapsed with the fall of the Romanov dynasty in March 1917 and the Bolshevik's withdrawal from the war a year later. Only in the mid-1950s did Moscow resume its bid to assert itself in a region which for millennia, had been the battle-ground between empires, races, cultures and religions. It reached a high point over the next decade, with arms deals with Israel's Arab neighbours and enemies, and then gradually declined after Israel's crushing victory over Egypt, Syria and Jordan in the 'Six Day War' of June 1967. (See Chapter 7) Beginning with Egyptian President Sadat's defection from his alliance with Moscow in the 1970s, the Kremlin's grip on the Middle East progressively weakened over the next three decades. Following the US-brokered Oslo Accords of 1993 and then, ten years later, the removal of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, a post-Soviet Moscow was left with Ba'athist Syria as its only client state in the entire region, one that also had and still maintains its close links with Iran, and sponsors, along with Iran, two of Corbyn's Jihadi 'friends', Hamas and Hezbollah. With the US and, more generally, the west, aligning itself with the Sunni Saudis, Shi'a Iran followed in the path of Syria by drawing close to Moscow. With some technical assistance from North Korea, Putin's other closest ally, Iran was able to manufacture ballistic missiles capable of reaching targets far beyond its main enemy, Israel. Iran also supplied Putin with drones for his war against Ukraine. Only yet another covert Mossad 'special forces' operation will prevent Iran arming its missile warheads with nuclear weapons, in total violation of its 2015 agreement with the western powers not to do so.

It is these admittedly complex relationships, part religious (Hezbollah, Iran and the ruling clique in Syria are all Shi'a) part geopolitical, that are the key to understanding why Corbyn not only acted as the advocate for Palestinian Jihadis, but felt obliged to defend the policies of the regimes that stood behind them. (Syria and Iran, together with Hamas and Hezbollah, endorsed Putin's 2022 invasion of Ukraine, while Corbyn blamed it on NATO's 'eastern expansion', and on more than one occasion, publicly condemned western military assistance for Ukraine, while not opposing Moscow's reliance on Iran and North Korea. For details, see Appendix XIV) Like his press officer Seamus Milne, Corbyn valued Russia's role as a counterweight to NATO. He also for the same reason took the side of the Ayatollahs because, since the 'Islamic Revolution' of 1979, the USA, the 'Great Satan' had been, together with the 'Zionist Entity', their number one enemy. Shi'a Iran's enmity towards its regional rival, Sunni Saudi Arabia, is both geo-political and religious, and one that Corbyn naturally shared, hence his readiness to condemn the Kingdom's atrocious human rights record, and his silence concerning Iran's. (See Appendix X) Hence also the Stop the War Coalition's as well as Corbyn's

studied refusal to condemn the numerous war crimes, including the use of chemical weapons, committed by Assad and his Russian allies, even though this proved too much even for some of his loyalist supporters to stomach. In October 2016, a letter addressed to the Founder and former Chairman of the ludicrously misnamed 'Stop the War Coalition', signed by 70 of his devotees, implored him to break his silence and to 'condemn, clearly and specifically, the actions of Assad and Russia in Syria, which have caused the overwhelming majority of civilian deaths and which present the biggest obstacle to any workable solution to the Syria crisis'. Of course, the appeal fell on peace campaigner Corbyn's deaf ears.

Anyone attending the Stop the War Coalition annual conference in London on October 8, 2016 would have witnessed the proof that given Corbyn's long-standing commitment to the Shia axis, and his former employment by Syria's Iranian allies, the possibility of a condemnation of the many atrocities committed by the Assad regime was, at best, remote in the extreme. Demonstrators outside and, before they were silenced or ejected, inside the meeting, staged protests against the Coalition's, and specifically, Corbyn's refusal to condemn Assad's (and thus also Putin's) war crimes. During the Labour Leader's address to the conference, there were cries of 'Jeremy Corbyn, where were you?', 'what about Aleppo' (flattened by repeated Russian chemical bombing raids) and 'your silence is complicit'. Corbynista loyalists drowned out further protests by chanting 'no more wars', excepting of course those waged by Putin and Assad. Corbyn's response was to recommend the same policy that he had advocated as the alternative to military action against the Islamic State, namely, a 'political solution'. Outside the meeting, an ejected protestor accused Corbyn of having 'deliberately marginalised Syrian voices', that he would 'never say the words, "Assad must go"'. Compensation for the lost support among his own cultic following came from what those not versed in left-right convergences would have found totally baffling, namely, the endorsement of Corbyn's pro-Assad stance by Nick Griffin, the one-time *Fuehrer* of the Neo-Nazi British National Party. He tweeted: 'If he [Corbyn] sticks to his guns then for the first time in my life, I will vote Labour. NOTHING is more important than resisting the psychotic rush to World War 3 of [Foreign Secretary] Boris and the neo-cons. Corbyn refuses to blame Assad for chemical attack in Syria.' (Griffin, like Corbyn, had been a guest of Assad, though not like Corbyn, once, or like another of his far right admirers, former KKK Grand Wizard David Duke, twice, but three times.)

Corbyn's commitment to the foreign no less than the domestic policies of the Iranian theocracy and its surrogates in Syria and Lebanon was total and unshakable. And just as throughout his career as MP he had been a consistent opponent of both NATO and the European Union ('tools of US policy') he never wavered in his hostility to Israel. Right up to his emergence as a candidate for the Labour Party leadership, he continued to foster his links with all manner of professional anti-Zionists, being none too choosy as to their provenance, as in October 2014, when Corbyn hosted yet another Parliamentary anti-Zionist 'event' at which one of the guest speakers was none other than fellow Press TV presenter James Thring. Although locating himself on the extreme right (he is an associate of David Duke, who as we shall see, like Thring, enthused over Corbyn's election as Labour Leader), when it came to Zionism, Thring talked the talk of the Sharia left, for example defending Ghaddafi against charges of sponsoring terrorism when the reality was, they had been 'invented by Mossad'. Israel, said Thring, was 'an illegal,

criminal, psychopathic, belligerent apartheid entity bent on desecrating the Holy Land and destroying anyone or even any country [sic] that tries to seek justice for the Palestinians.' Thring also had impeccable anti-Semitic credentials as an associate of such professional Jew-baiters and Holocaust deniers as the two blue-blooded Neo-Nazis, Dowager Lady Birdwood and Lady Michele Renouf, together with David Irving and Chomsky's *cause celebre*, Serge Thion. Thring had also appeared as a presenter with former BNP Vice Chairman Richard Edmonds in a pro-Nazi video on the Allied bombing of Dresden. Yet he was a speaker at Corbyn's Westminster 'event', while on July 26, 2014, Renouf and Thring both marched with Corbyn in support of Hamas in its war against Israel.

Sometimes Corbyn's anti-western zeal carried him beyond the call of duty, in doing so, running the risk of making himself a laughing stock, as when he praised Iran's Orwellian-named and government-sponsored 'Iranian Human Rights Commission,' declaring that he 'like[d] the sense of values surrounding it'. The 'values' which Corbyn shared with the Commission were reflected in his diplomatic silence as the clerical fascists who ruled Iran carried out an average of an execution of one a day in the four years of his employment with Press TV, likewise when the bogus Commission celebrated the Paris massacre of the *Charlie Hebdo* staff by conferring on its victims an 'Islamophobe of the Year' award. Corbyn, being infinitely gullible, possibly really did believe that the Commission existed to protect what were in reality non-existent human rights in Iran, even when, (like Corbyn), it had nothing to say when two Iranian poets, Fateme Ekhtesari and Mehdi Massavi, were sentenced in October 2015 by an Islamic court to 99 lashes and nine and eleven and a half years in prison respectively for 'undermining the security of the Islamic state'. Ekhtesari, since she wrote from a feminist perspective, was predictably accused by the court of 'passing dangerous messages that could encourage people to distance themselves from the true faith', one which Corbyn, like Obama, on every possible occasion praised for its tolerant and peaceful nature. Just as predictably, neither were there any protests on her behalf from her western sisters, their enemy being the west's 'white patriarchy', not Muslim misogyny. (See Chapter 3) The two jailed poets were far from being the only writers to run afoul of Iran's Thought Police. The poet Hashem Saabani was hanged in 2014 after making a forced confession, Stalinist Show Trial fashion, on Iranian TV, while the leftist poet Sa'id Sultanpour was abducted on his wedding day on the orders of Ayatollah Khomeini and murdered in prison without even a mock trial. Rahman Hatefi-Monfared met a similar fate, having his veins cut and then left to bleed to death in prison. All told, the number of writers murdered by the Iranian theocrats exceeds one hundred. If only they had just written, 'death to Israel, death to America'.

Until Labour's defeat at the May 2015 General Election, the 66-year-old Corbyn had never been seen, except by a small circle of admiring co-thinkers, as anything other than a dim-witted, harmless crank, a peace and human rights campaigner with a soft spot for dictators, torturers, Jew-baiters and killers theocrats, war criminals, Holocaust deniers and suicide bombers, an exotic, if also odious hang-over from the Labour Party's self-destructive pre-Blair past, a political lightweight, to put it as its kindest, into all manner of fringe causes from magic potions to Jewish conspiracies, a professional back-bench rebel with bees in his bonnet about the sins of Zionism in particular and the west generally, regarded by most of his Parliamentary colleagues as essentially a yesterday's man serving out his time. And

yet despite his long-term associations with all manner of political pond life, some saw him as endowed with almost saintly qualities. Either uninformed or unconcerned about his intimate connections with those I have listed, the pop singer-turned-pundit Charlotte Church captured perfectly the quasi-religious yearnings of the Corbyn cult when she claimed to have discerned in him 'something inherently [sic!] virtuous'. Somebody needed to tell her about the virtuous one's dealings with Jihadis who slaughtered Jews and clerics who hanged gays and murdered poets.

When Corbyn entered the lists as a contender for the Labour Party leadership, his activities and interests, which had for years been on the outermost fringe of left wing politics, dramatically moved centre stage. Previously, independently of Corbyn, though with his support and participation, there had already emerged a broadly based 'anti-austerity' movement directed against the Tory government's economic and social policies. Though supported by the far left, and as part of that, its Sharia wing, the vast majority of its largely youthful participants were activated by purely domestic 'bread and butter' issues, as was evident from the banners and posters on display on its demonstrations. All this changed when Corbyn scraped up just enough Labour MPs' votes to enter the leadership contest, some of these coming from MPs who, though opposed to his policies, wanted to 'open up' the contest to a left winger. The entirely unintended result was to 'open up' the Labour Party to a Trojan Horse invasion that would dwarf the Jihadi Muslim teachers' Birmingham schools operation in its magnitude and political consequences. Taking advantage of ill-considered new voting rules, genuine 'anti-austerity' activists, organised non-and anti-Labour party leftists (along with Tories who, correctly, as it turned out, saw Corbyn as a certain election loser) registered as members for a fee of only £3, to vote in as the new Labour leader someone who, for all his leftist credentials, also consorted with Irish and Palestinian terrorists, pro-Putin Stalinists, Latin American dictators, Hitler-admirers, Nazi apologists, anti-Semitic clerics and Holocaust and 9/11 deniers. Though lionised by celebrities and well-healed lefties, he was however far less popular with Labour voters, with only one in five favouring him as the new party leader.

We can be reasonably sure that the Jihadi dimension to his political agenda had been unknown to the vast majority of those drawn into the anti-austerity campaign and who now saw him as the obvious candidate to support. But this was certainly not the case with the politically more seasoned, who would have had first-hand knowledge of his long and many associations with the anti-Zionist cause. Corbyn's election campaign thus acquired a dual character, the populist flavoured 'anti-austerity' agenda which Corbyn, largely by default, had successfully hijacked, and that of the Sharia left, which Corbyn had faithfully promoted throughout his years as a Labour MP. Once the second came under media scrutiny, the challenge was to somehow prevent it from alienating supporters of the first. Subsequent events would prove, quite shamefully for those concerned, that if such fears were indeed entertained, they were to prove groundless. Indeed, there is good reason to suppose that once it became more generally known, his anti-Zionist profile proved to be a plus, not a minus.

The direction in which Corbyn's bandwagon was rolling could be easily ascertained from those who were scrambling to get a ride on it. On board along with Livingstone, Galloway (not even a Labour Party member, but who cared?) and the whole tribe of professional Zionist baiters were three other non-members: anti-voting campaigner, champagne anarchist and later, Trump and Putin apologist,

Russell Brand, who justified the use of terrorist tactics by Hamas against Israel; 'socialist realist' film director Ken Loach and one-time supporter of the Gaddafi-financed Workers Revolutionary Party who, in 1987, directed the play *Perdition*, written by another old Healyite, Jimmy Allen, which accused Zionists of collaborating with the Nazis in the Final Solution, and was prominent in the anti-Israeli Boycott Disinvestment and Sanctions campaign; and the academic Mary Beard, who made her political debut in September 2001 when, after 9/11, she proclaimed in print and on air that 'they [that is, 2,793 office workers] had it coming', a sentiment shared by Corbyn, with his cynical 'what goes around comes around'. The incurably politically promiscuous Sharia Roman Catholic Galloway, who before Saddam Hussein's fall, was captured on camera in Baghdad saluting the genocidal dictator for his 'courage', 'strength' and 'indefatigability', like many of the far left, effortlessly combined his endorsement of the pro-Muslim migrant Corbyn with support for the anti-migrant UKIP campaign to vote the UK out of the European Union.

A survey of the leadership contest conducted in the closing days of the campaign confirmed that Corbyn had indeed attracted substantial support from those with views on foreign policy that can be broadly categorised as approximating those of his Sharia leftist and Muslim allies. 28% agreed with the statement that 'the world is controlled by a [unspecified, but in the light of subsequent developments, one can guess] secret elite', compared with an average of 14% for the other three candidates, 45% opposed the RAF bombing the Islamic State, as against 18% for the remaining three, while 51% agreed with the statement that 'the USA is the greatest threat to world peace', compared with an average of 18% for the rest. These proved to be significant variations.

What most of Corbyn's extra-Parliamentary activities and connections had in common was a visceral hostility towards the United States and Israel and, though it was usually in the case of non-Muslims disguised as a shared anti-Zionism, long standing associations with those who chief political loathing was directed at Jews. As a result, because of these associations, for all his posturing as a life-long opponent of racism, accusations of anti-Semitism and its attendant conspiracy theories followed Corbyn around like bad smells. When reports of these links began filtering into the mainstream media, rather late in the day it must be said, Labour's Jewish shadow Northern Ireland spokesman, Ivan Lewis, condemned Corbyn's 'anti-Semitic rhetoric', and called for a policy of 'Zero tolerance' in the Labour Party towards prejudice against Jews. The non-observant Jewish journalist Nick Cohen also weighed in with a few choice comments. Understandably alarmed, unlike the Sharia left, at the however unlikely prospect of the election of a Labour government led by a politician with Corbyn's profile, the *Jewish Chronicle* challenged him to account for his known and acknowledged connections and collaboration with avowed 'Holocaust deniers, terrorists and some outright anti-Semites.': 'It is little short of astonishing that a man who chooses to associate with racists and extremists is about to become the leader of one of our two major parties and conceivably become Prime Minister'.

All of these charges were true. The heat was now, at last, on Corbyn, even if, disgracefully, it had been left to a Jewish MP, a Jewish journalist and a Jewish weekly to apply it. As if to confirm the *Chronicle's* accusations, being one of the organisation's sponsors, Corbyn had been due to speak at a Palestinian Solidarity Campaign event in London, where one of the guests invited was the cartoonist

Carlos Lattuf. As his speciality was depicting Jews as Nazis, he had entered the Iranian theocracy's 2015 anti-Semitic Holocaust cartoon competition (first prize \$12,000). Another speaker was an Iranian academic who approved of suicide bombings of Israeli Jews. Caught with his Sharia trousers down, the 'inherently virtuous' Corbyn, without explaining why, hurriedly withdrew from the event, even though it was in no way any different in either its purpose or composition from the many he had either hosted himself at Westminster or addressed in public in his years as a Labour MP. His campaign staff (but not Corbyn himself) initially issued a statement in response to the *Chronicle* article which not only dissociated Corbyn from the views of 9/11 conspiracist Eisen, but also denied that Corbyn had ever had any dealings with him. Another convenient lapse of memory? So, either Eisen or Corbyn's staff was lying. But when challenged directly over his association with Eisen, Corbyn admitted that Eisen's account of his dealings with himself were true, even to the extent of Corbyn's funding his wretched little band of Jew-baiters. Feeling the trap closing, Corbyn tried another tack, claiming that if he had known of Eisen's views about the Holocaust, he would never have associated himself with Eisen or lent Eisen's group his support, because 'Holocaust deniers are vile and wrong'. Likewise, one hopes, Holocaust celebrators. Yet both categories were to be found in substantial numbers among his collaborators, including those Corbyn chose to call his 'friends'. As for Corbyn not being aware of Eisen's anti-Semitism, this was yet another lie. Let us recall that Eisen had been treated as a pariah even by his own PSC, for reasons that Corbyn must have been well aware of.

Leaving aside for the moment Corbyn's public, well-documented, acknowledged and long-term associations with other anti-Semites who were presumably no less 'vile and wrong' for sharing Eisen's rejection of the Holocaust, let me pose this question: Here we had a veteran MP with Prime Ministerial ambitions who had remained on friendly terms for the best part of *fifteen years* with someone holding well-advertised views about the Jews so 'vile', to quote Corbyn, as to exclude him from any association with the UK's main anti-Zionist movement, one, moreover, of which Corbyn was both a founder and a patron. Corbyn, an avowed anti-racist, nevertheless funded Eisen's anti-Semitic activities and *even attend this anti-Semite's annual meetings*, and yet still did have so much as an inkling as to what Eisen's opinions about the Jews were? This is indeed extraordinary, leaving us with only two possible explanations: either Corbyn was such a gullible fool that it rendered him unfit to hold any public office, however humble, let alone be a party leader or, Allah forbid, a Prime Minister, or he was a liar. Let us be charitable and opt for the first. But there was no repudiation, either by Corbyn or his campaign staff, of his high profile and well-advertised associations with and endorsements of his 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah, or denial of the connections that we have listed with Jewish conspiracy theorists and anti-Semites, ranging from the Holocaust-denying Thring to Muslim convert Abdur Raheen Green and the Rev. Stephen Sizer. How could there be, since all were a matter of public record? Maybe some anti-Semites are less 'vile' than others.

Whether it was the intention or not, the charge of anti-Semitism threw the spotlight on the dual nature of Corbyn's leadership bid. Given Corbyn's very public track record on Israel and assiduous cultivation of his links with Muslim politicians, institutions, anti-Semitic pressure groups, terrorists and clerics, and leaving aside the motives of Tory tactical voters and politically naive anti-austerity activists, it was not difficult to identify other potential sources of Labour Party

membership applications that followed Corbyn's announcement of his intention to stand as the Party's new leader. What we had here was another 'Operation Trojan Horse', also one with an Islamic dimension, though executed not by stealth, as in the schools of Birmingham, but by invitation.

In the course of a number of promotional interviews with Corbyn, the normally virulently anti-Labour *Socialist Worker* marvelled (perhaps because in the rape crisis-ridden SWP, the flow had been in the opposite direction) at the 'numbers of people joining Labour to take part in the election', and that 'masses' were attending Corbyn's rallies. Alex Callinicos, who had once warned of the dangers of allowing 'all sorts of political [i.e., socialist] demands' to jeopardise his party's harmonious relationship with Muslim pressure groups, now enthused about a leftist campaign being 'borne forward by a tidal wave of enthusiasm', an 'extra-parliamentary movement that has grown up around him [in other words, a cult] that will remain his source of strength.' While SWP General Secretary Charles Kimber sounded a more sceptical note, arguing that even under Corbyn's leadership, Labour would remain an obstacle rather than an ally, he drew attention to one issue that 'set him apart from the three other candidates': 'At one recent event, Corbyn supported boycotts and disinvestment against Israel in support of the Palestinians.' Here for Sharia left watchers was surely a straw in the wind. But although wishing 'good luck to him', Kimber seemed to be making it clear that his party would not consent to its members taking the steps necessary to vote for Corbyn: 'We are not joining Labour or registering as members - a process that requires a pledge that "I support the aims and values of the Labour Party and I am not a supporter of any organisation opposed to it."'

Since when has lying proved an obstacle to leftists seeking to worm their way into the Labour Party? Did not Lenin, in his once well-known *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, a polemic against revolutionaries who refused to work inside mass reformist organisations, demand that they must cast aside their scruples and be prepared to 'resort to various stratagems, artifices and illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges'? (Here, as in so many other respects, Lenin radically deviated from principles enunciated by Marx and Engels in their *Communist Manifesto*: 'The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims'.) Perhaps the SWP's General Secretary was unaware not only of Lenin's advocacy of the tactic later known as 'entryism', but of his own party's history. From the early 1950s to the mid-1960s, all the UK's warring Trotskyists groups were 'entryists', including Tony Cliffe's International Socialists, forerunner of the Socialist Workers Party, along with Gerry Healy's Socialist Labour League (after 1973, 'Workers Revolutionary Party', the WRP) and the Militant 'tendency' led by Ted Grant, surely the world's most boring Leninist. As 'entryists', all, in different ways and at different times, as Lenin and, in the later 1930s, Trotsky advised, had feigned loyalty to a party whose democratic values and reformist policies they all repudiated.

Evidence that the party line was not quite as Kimber claimed came two weeks later when, with Corbyn's leadership prospects threatened by the (long overdue) exposure of his many fraternal associations with Holocaust deniers, Jewish conspiracy theorists and Jew-killing Jihadis, the August 16 on-line Newsletter of the SWP front, the misnamed Stop the War Coalition (of which Corbyn had been one of its founders and Chairpersons), carried a reproduction of the Labour leadership ballot paper, together with instructions on 'how to vote for Corbyn'. So, 'We are all Corbynites now!' And sure enough, following Corbyn's election, the

SWP, along with a number of other leftist groups, joined the so called 'Momentum' in its campaign to purge the Parliamentary Labour Party of its majority of anti-Corbyn MPs, by securing their de-selection before the next General Election, and their replacement by Corbynite stooges. By their involvement in this operation, the hitherto anti-Labour Sharia left had officially endorsed Corbyn as their 'Palestinian Candidate' for the next General Election. But so had numerous Tories, including a government minister. By cross checking the May 2015 General Election canvass returns with the names and addresses of the 300,000 or so new applicants for Labour Party membership (double the party's pre-Corbyn membership) it was discovered that at least 20% of these applicants had declared their intention to vote for parties other than Labour at the 2015 General Election. Incredibly, a proposal to disqualify Tory entryists from voting in the leadership election, even though it was backed by the party's legal advisers, was blocked by Corbyn supporters on the Labour Party's National Executive Committee. If Corbyn's victory required Tory votes, so be it. Strange allies for a man of the left.

After his election as Labour Party Leader, some argued in Corbyn's defence that the accusations brought against him of anti-Semitism were a classic case of seeking to establish a 'guilt by association', as indeed one of his most loyal, if not brightest supporters, Diane Abbott had claimed: 'Jeremy has done thousands of meetings rallies and memorial events. Now [but why only 'now'?] if over those thirty years he has been on a platform with someone who is clear now [again] is an anti-Semite, given the chaotic [sic] character of the liberation [i.e., anti-Zionist] movement, that will happen. That doesn't make Jeremy an anti-Semite.' This attempt at a defence of the indefensible was puerile. There are several kinds of association one person can have with another, and nearly all will by their very nature and setting be entirely innocent. A casual conversation with a total stranger on a bus about the weather belongs to this category, even if the stranger, without advertising it in any way, happens to be an advocate of Holocaust denial. But the same cannot be said if it was not a single chance encounter, in a non-political setting, but a series of deliberate, public associations for a shared political cause, on a regular basis, for 'thirty years' and on 'thousands' of occasions, such as Abbott said Corbyn had participated in, willingly and knowingly, for the explicit and mutually agreed purpose of common political action directed against a Jewish state, with a person or persons whose denial of the Holocaust and hostility towards the Jews were a matter of public record. So much for Abbotts 'now'.

This is indeed guilt, better defined as one of *collaboration*, in criminal law, joint enterprise, rather than mere association, and would, if tested in a court of law, be proved to be such, as it indeed it was in the failed libel action brought in 2000 by the far-right historian David Irving against Penguin books and Professor Deborah Lipstadt for allegations made about Irving in her book, *Denying the Holocaust - The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. One of the allegations objected to by Irving was that his associations with anti-Semitic movements and individuals was sufficient grounds to prove that he shared their views about the Jews. The movements and individuals in question, all of Neo-Nazi provenance, were identical in their hatred of the Jews, advocacy of Jewish conspiracy theories and denial of the Holocaust to those Corbyn had associated with. Rejecting Irving's claim that he was being accused of guilt by association, in his final ruling, Justice Gray had 'no doubt that most, if not all of them, are Neo-Nazis and who are racist and anti-Semitic. I also have no doubt that Irving was aware of their political views. [Just as

Corbyn must have been of those of his platform companions.] His association with such individuals indicates in my judgement that Irving shares many of their political beliefs.’

If Corbyn had been so ill-advised as to instigate libel proceedings in response to an identical and no less well-founded accusation, the Irving case had provided the legal precedent for an identical verdict. (See Appendix T for his associations with avowed anti-Semites, including one who cited approvingly from *Mein Kampf*, and another who recycled on-line the myth of a world Jewish conspiracy, and was twice photographed with Corbyn at pro-Palestinian functions.) Corbyn did not help his case when, in July and then August of 2018, two videos came to light of his speaking at two anti-Zionist hate-fests. He said of the first, which he hosted at Westminster, that ‘in pursuit of justice for the Palestinian people’, he had ‘on occasion [sic] appeared on platforms with people whose views I completely [sic] reject.’ ‘Completely’? But how could that be? Surely, they at the very least shared what he described as his ‘pursuit of justice for the Palestinian people’. Otherwise, what were they, or he, doing on the same anti-Zionist platform? Nobody, least of all a seasoned politician and campaigner like Corbyn, appears on platforms with speakers with whom they share *nothing*. Of the second meeting, where Israel was compared to Nazi Germany, a spokesman said on his behalf that ‘Mr Corbyn was not responsible for everything said at every meeting he has attended’. That would be true if Corbyn was sitting in the audience. But he had not just ‘attended’ this meeting. *Corbyn was a featured speaker*, sharing the platform with another speaker who had been invited to appear on it by the PSC, presumably, as is the normal procedure at such events, with the knowledge and agreement of his or her platform partner(s). In this case, Corbyn’s platform partner was a speaker who compared Israel with Nazi Germany. If indeed Corbyn found that statement repugnant, in view of his status in the PSC as its founder and Patron, it would have not only been within his rights, but his duty, to say from the platform at that meeting that such views had no place in the PSC. But there is irrefutable evidence that they do (I refer the reader again to Appendix T), and, moreover, that Corbyn shares them. So he remained silent, preferring to maintain the united front of all anti-Zionists, no matter what their views on the ‘Jewish question’ might be. On a platform in Trafalgar Square, Corbyn demanded that everyone show respect for a religion that preaches hatred and genocide against the Jews. But when the target is Israel, literally anything goes.

Aside from his domestic agenda, which does not concern us here except when it impinges on Islam and his overseas concerns, his record and associations, taken together with his endorsements by the Sharia left, are proof that for all his many Palestinian affiliations, Corbyn was no standard bearer for socialist internationalism. Quite the contrary in fact. As we have seen, he served as the mouthpiece for the most reactionary, theocratic and anti-Semitic tendencies of Palestinian nationalism. Perhaps in Corbyn’s defence it could be said that he lacks the necessary political ability to distinguish between someone whose only concern is the advocacy of Palestinian nationhood, a cause, incidentally, that I also support, and someone who uses the Palestine issue, as some undoubtedly do, to slander the Jews. Because for sure, some of Corbyn’s comments on Middle Eastern and Islamic affairs display a level of sophistication and factual knowledge that one would expect from someone who after attending a prep school and scraping two Es at A level, failed to complete a spoof degree in ‘Trade Union Studies’. We

have already noted his observation that the killing of Bin Laden, the architect of 9/11, was a 'tragedy'. He easily trumped this however when, on learning of reports that 'Jihadi John', the UK born Muslim assassin who appeared on a video decapitating an Islamic State prisoner, had been killed by a US drone attack, he responded that it would have been 'far better if he had been arrested'. However, Corbyn neglected to give any details as to how this was to be done. Given his comments on how Islamic terrorism was to be countered, if at all, let me guess what he could have had in mind. Due process was to be effected by dispatching a UK police constable, armed with a warrant card, a truncheon and a pair of handcuffs, to the Islamic State, who then, on his arrival in Raqqa, the capital of the Islamic State, would enquire of the relevant authorities as to the whereabouts of the said offender. On receiving this information, after locating and cautioning the suspect and informing him of his rights, he would then place him under arrest, cuff him, and escort him back to the UK to stand trial, though on what specific charge Corbyn neglected to specify. I suggest breach of the peace.

15 Zeal

From the earliest years of the USSR until its collapse in 1991, there were always those in the West who, by their stance on international issues, could be classified as the pro-Soviet, 'fellow travelling' left, a left that like its Sharia successor today, would be highly selective as to who deserved its solidarity; the Vietnamese resisting a very real US imperialism, of course, and quite rightly, but not those battling for trade union rights in Poland and the USSR, dissidents suffering psychiatric abuse in Soviet prisons, or entire peoples resisting Kremlin imperialist invasions and occupations in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan. One of the worst cases in this respect in recent times was undoubtedly that of someone who once described himself as 'a 'personal friend of Corbyn for 40 years'. That 'friend' was the ultra-Stalinist one-time Miners' Union President Arthur Scargill. He began his political career as a member of the Young Communist League, only to leave it in disgust at Khrushchev's 'Secret Speech' of 1956 denouncing Stalin, and ended it as a stalwart of the British Stalin Society (yes, there is such an entity. Its founder, Kami Majid, joined with Corbyn in launching the Stop the War Coalition.)

In between, as President of the National Union of Mineworkers, he denounced the ten million strong Polish Solidarity trade union movement, which had been driven underground in December 1981 by a military coup instigated by the Kremlin, as an 'anti-socialist organisation which desires the overthrow of a socialist state.' But he went further, far further, when on December 16, 1981, during a protest strike against General Jaruzelski's military coup, nine coal miners (yes, *brother coal miners*) were shot dead and 22 wounded by police at the Wujek coal mine in Silesia. Corbyn's 'friend' refused to condemn the massacre, claiming that the coup and the ensuing repression were justified because Solidarity had become 'too political'. This from someone who destroyed the NUM by manipulating its members into a political battle they could not hope to win.

Payback time for Scargill's treachery but, unfortunately, one also visited on the NUM's members, came when as part of its strategy to defeat the miners' strike of 1984-5, the Tory government of Margaret Thatcher imported large shipments of coal supplied by Scargill's comrades in 'communist' Poland. (Poland's rulers had previously provided an identical service to Franco during an Asturian miners' strike in the summer of 1970) As Solidarity, with the approval of Scargill, was now outlawed, there was little or nothing Poland's coal miners could do to prevent the coal they dug being used to break the UK miners' strike. There is no record of Scargill publicly protesting against his Polish comrades' involvement in Thatcher's strike breaking strategy. His loyalty to the Kremlin took precedence over the one he owed to his own members. Some solidarities are more compelling than others. After retiring from his two failed careers as union official and Bolshevik revolutionary, Scargill returned to his first and true love, Stalin, as a member of the British Stalin Society and, as such, endorsed Corbyn's bid for leadership of the Labour Party. This was only to be expected. In the course of a speech to his miniscule Socialist Labour Party in October 2018, he told his audience that 'Jeremy Corbyn has been a personal friend of mine for forty years'. Another die-hard Stalinist friend of Corbyn's, Stalin Society founder Kamal Maji, was a co-founder and Patron with Corbyn of the Stop the War Coalition. He also, like Scargill, backed Corbyn's bid

for the Labour leadership. Some will find it odd that a human rights campaigner such as Corbyn claimed to be would, as with his inner team while Labour Leader, throughout his political career, along with all other manner of political low life, seek the company and collaboration of Stalinists or at the very least, Stalinist fellow travellers such as himself. Scargill belonged to first category, until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, always being prepared, like others of his ilk on the left, to either deny or justify any crime committed by his adopted fatherland. However, I can vouch from personal experience, there were others on the left at that time who, unlike the Scargills, could be relied upon to raise their voices against any injustice, irrespective of the political colouration of the regime involved, protesting to the relevant authorities against the violation of political freedoms and trade union rights, demanding the release of political prisoners, and an end to the repression of national minorities. Sadly, they are a dying breed. The only international issues that really interest the majority of the far left today are opposing Western foreign policy (See Appendix XIV) and supporting what are called 'the rights of the Palestinians' which, along with many other freedoms taken for granted in the western world, do not extend to their right to regular and free elections enjoyed by their fellow Palestinians in Israel. As of 2023, the last election conducted under the auspices of the Palestinian Authority was held 17 years ago, in 2006. In the same period (2006 to 2023) Israel had held nine.

The rights of labour in countries like China, where countless millions of workers are cruelly exploited, suffer the most devastating industrial disasters and are denied the right to organise, does not interest today's left in the least, anymore more than does the oppression of women, and gays, and the persecution of national and religious minorities such as the Yazidis, Copts, Samaritans, Zoroastrians, Assyrians and Kurds, by Islamic regimes and movements. For Allah's useful idiots, there is only one issue and one enemy...Israel. And in Parliamentary constituencies where the Muslim vote is there for the taking, such as Corbyn's in Islington North and what were Galloway's in Tower Hamlets and Bradford, placing anti-Zionism at the top of the agenda demonstrated that there was a certain perverse kind of 'international solidarity' that could pay handsome domestic dividends.

Quite apart from these parochial, some might say opportunist electoral concerns, raising overseas issues other than those of the Middle East would be seen by anti-Zionist zealots such as Corbyn and Livingstone as a diversion from the only fight that matters...against Israel.. Acting on this principle, MPs and trade union officials of the Corbyn variety directed all their invective against the one state in the Middle East where women do have equal rights with men and gays are not publicly beheaded or hanged from the back of a lorry but, in defiance of Mosaic law, are afforded the right to legally recognised civil unions, one derided by Israel's infidel enemies as 'pink-washing', a country where workers, Jew and Arab alike, are paid the highest wages, have more employment rights, better working conditions and state benefits than in any Islamic country; where trade unions are free, powerful and open to all, where citizens can form, join and vote for any party of their choice other than a racist one, where all faiths are equal, where Arabs and Jews are equal before the law, where the press and speech are free, and where, unlike the regimes and movements exalted by the Sharia left, it is not a crime to be against the government or to leave or criticise a religion, because Israel does not have a state religion. This is the state that Corbyn, Livingstone and Galloway, together with the rest of the Sharia left, wanted to see, as do the Iranian Ayatollahs,

erased from the map, and any individual or movement, however tainted with anti-Semitism and even Nazism, was welcomed as an ally in that sordid undertaking.

But the influence of the Sharia left and its fellow travellers did and does not stop with overt political actions. Its influence, less obviously exerted, but for that very reason often far more effective, was and is felt in not only in Parliament but also the trade unions, and in a less obviously partisan fashion, in the media, especially television, and *academe*, local government, social services, the artistic and entertainment industries and more generally in what is best described as the 'radical establishment'. Freelance journalist John Pilger was typical of this breed. His main interest was stories with an anti-US dimension, a focus that located him firmly within the Sharia leftist orbit, although his comment, in the *New Statesman*, that Israel was the 'guiding hand' behind US foreign policy, and the allegation that 'middle class Jewish homes in Britain' were somehow privy to the secret workings of this relationship, could just as easily have appeared in a Neo-Nazi publication obsessed with a World Jewish Conspiracy.

This is no exaggeration. Pilger's anti-Jewish invective provided ready-made copy for far-right publications, being reproduced at the time of the Iraq war of 2003 by the National Front, Combat 18 and the White Nationalist Party, along with anti-Semitic cartoons from Arab websites. And Pilger returned the compliment. One-time US far-leftist turned far right anti-Semite and conspiracy theorist Lyndon LaRouche published a fabricated account, in his *Executive Intelligence (sic) Review*, of a pro-Zionist cabal guiding US foreign policy. Hardly original, as we have seen, with identical comments from Corbyn et al, but for some, too good to pass up, despite the suspect source. Three leftist journals recycled their own versions of it, the *Guardian*, *Morning Star* and *New Statesmen*. The author of the last two? John Pilger. In an article for the anti-Zionist *New Statesman* objecting to the building of the massive Westfield shopping centre in East London as being bad for local small shop-keepers, Pilger could not resist the urge to feed readers with the totally irrelevant information that Westfield had been founded by Frank Lowry, 'an Australian-Israeli billionaire', a 'former Israeli commando' who 'gives money to Israel.'

Such is the pro Islam zeal of the *dhimmi* left, and those taken in tow by it, that out of a concern not to offend what it assumed to be Muslim opinion, it led on one notable occasion to the advocacy of a policy that provoked a rebuke from one of its more enlightened representatives. In February 2015, on the eve of a Parliamentary vote on a bill that would make abortions illegal for reasons of gender selection (or rather rejection), the Trades Union Congress General Council called on trade union-sponsored Labour MPs to vote against the proposed bill on the grounds that if adopted as law it would, quote, 'divide communities'. How it would do so was not made clear, any more than were the identities of the 'communities' it would supposedly 'divide'. However, what one can assume with confidence is that those behind the initiative (and they could have only been the Sharia left, or those trade union officials either influenced or beholden to it in some way) believed that to prosecute Muslim parents who solicited the aborting of female foetuses (which does indeed occur in the UK, for why else the bill?) would somehow lead to the mysongistic practice becoming generally known in the non-Muslim 'community', and hence give rise to yet more 'Islamophobia'. But in that case, why stop there? Exactly the same considerations could be advanced to justify the legalisation of female genital mutilation (and indeed the SWP did oppose

prosecutions under existing legislation), 'honour killings', the beating and raping of wives and under age, bigamous and forced marriages. And why not? After all, Germany accepts as legal under age Muslim marriages, and since 2008, the UK has recognised as legal Muslim (but only Muslim) bigamous marriages, so long as they are contracted outside the UK. Both spouses are entitled to benefits...an exemplary case of 'inclusion' and 'diversity'.

How ironic that on this occasion, in another exercise in cultural 'diversity', the Sharia left had proved itself to be more Muslim than the Muslims, because a Muslim, Dr. Jafa Quershi, of the Medical Ethics Alliance, made it very clear that rejection of the bill 'would put Britain on the slippery to designer families'. Could the cretins behind this initiative not see that by drawing attention to those British Muslim parents who, for traditional misogynistic reasons, did solicit gender abortions, they were stigmatising the very 'Islamic community' they said they wished to protect? Nevertheless, gender demographics strongly suggest that such a practice does exist, for why else the legislation to ban it? While UK Muslim women live on average some three years longer than Muslim men, Muslim females comprise only 48% of all UK Muslims, compared with 51% for the UK population as a whole.

In Islamic countries, there are good reasons to suppose that female infanticide is far more widespread, with the all-important proviso that due to the lack of the necessary medical facilities, some, if not most eliminations of baby girls would have to be post, rather than pre-natal. If this assumption is wrong, as no doubt many Muslims and all Islamophiles would claim, then I challenge them to produce a plausible alternative explanation for the following demographic anomalies. In not only nearly all European countries, but also those from other continents and cultures with the sole exception of those dominated by Islam, we see the recurring pattern of women living longer, usually around five years, than men, resulting, as one would expect, in the population being significantly more female than male. For example, in France, a typical advanced European state, the expectation of life for females is 85.0 years, and for men, 78.7. Assuming an equal birth rate between male and female (which is normally the case) this results in this case in a gender imbalance in the French population of 51.52% females and 48.48% males. This pattern, with tiny variations, recurs right across Europe and in most other regions of the world. We find it in countries that differ from each other in a number of significant ways...in culture, climate, religion, wealth etc. In Catholic Mexico, life expectation for men is 74.8, and for women 79.6, leading to gender balance of 48.83% male and 51.17% female. In Buddhist Burma, male life expectation is 62.9, and female, 67.7, with a gender balance of 49.71% male and 50.29% female. In Shinto Japan, life expectation for males is 79.7, and for females 86.4, giving a gender balance of 48.4% male and 51.6 female. And so on. When we come to countries with a mainly Muslim population this pattern changes significantly, as the following examples, from a number of widely varying regions, show:

Country	Life expectancy (years)		Gender Balance (%)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Jordan	78.8	81.6	51.55	48.45
Libya	61.7	65.1	51.89	48.11
Pakistan	64.5	68.3	51.37	48.63
Bangladesh	67.6	71.3	50.07	49.93
Iraq	69.2	72.0	50.64	49.36
Malaysia	72.3	77.2	51.48	48.52
Egypt	65.6	71.4	51.13	48.87
Iran	70.9	74.7	50.71	49.29
Sudan	60.6	64.7	50.53	49.47
Syria	71.9	76.7	51.11	48.89
Turkey	71.5	76.1	50.23	49.77
Yemen	62.1	66.3	50.74	49.26
Somalia	48.9	52.8	50.20	49.80

In each of these examples...and there are many more that show the same trend...we have countries with a predominately and in some cases high on totally Muslim population where, contrary to the pattern prevailing elsewhere, significantly longer lives for women do not lead, as one would expect it would, to a population with more females than males. In some of the above countries, the imbalances between the genders would be even greater but for predominately male migration from them to the Gulf oil states where, as a result, the male populations in those countries greatly exceeds that of females:

Country	% Native	% Muslim immigrant (circa)	Male	Female
Bahrain	46	25	62	38
Kuwait	35	35	56	44
Qatar	20	60	74	26
Saudi Arabia	74	20	57	43
UAR	15	45	75	25

I leave it to the reader to draw their own conclusions as to why, in the world of Islam, males, though dying earlier, significantly exceed females, whereas in the world of the *kuffar* where men also die earlier, the reverse is the case.

16 Goal!

Individuals usually join far left groups when young, often as students. While a small minority then become absorbed into the group's apparatus as part-time activists or even full-time junior officials, the majority tend to drop out as they move up the professional ladder and acquire family and career responsibilities, though, some will salve their guilty consciences by donating money or going on demonstrations. Others who retain a profound loyalty to the ideas that attracted them to the movement in the first place will feel a far deeper obligation to propagate its policies in what ways they can. This is your 'fellow traveller', or in espionage parlance, 'sleeper', who can often be of more use to the cause than those whose allegiance is obvious and well known. Especially if occupying positions of some influence and leverage in society, it is through such former members that the policies and goals of the far left, suitably diluted and packaged, can be filtered into the public arena through various channels, principally academe and the media, in the UK for example the BBC, *The Guardian* and *The Independent* newspapers, and the weekly *New Statesman*, and more recently, on line by social media.

Via these various conduits, Israel can be and has been bombarded from all sides, not excluding the literary. To cite just four instances of many, we have the *New Statesman*, which claimed to have detected what it called a 'kosher [sic] conspiracy [sic]' to control the UK, while the *Guardian* chose Holocaust Memorial Day to run a story on how UK tax payers were funding security for Jewish Schools. Now why would they need that? Doing its bit for the anti-Zionist cause, the *Independent* featured a Nazi-style cartoon of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon as a cannibal eating alive a Palestinian baby. Finally, the poet and Oxford academic Tom Paulin, a regular guest on BBC culture programmes, famously (or infamously) vented his spleen on the Jews both in verse, cursing the 'Zionist SS', and in the main Egyptian daily, *Al-Ahram*, declaring that Jewish settlers from New York 'should be shot dead. I think they are Nazis...I feel nothing but hatred for them'. He had 'never believed that Israel should exist at all'. When Paulin accused Israeli Jews of being Nazis, was he aware that at the end of Second World War, Egypt had served as a safe haven, not for Jewish 'Nazis' 'from Brooklyn' (why only 'Brooklyn?'), but real Nazis - SS officers and high-ranking state and party officials fleeing Allied prosecution for their role in the Holocaust? One of many was the notorious SS General Oskar Dirlwanger, Gestapo chief of Warsaw, who helped direct the crushing of the Warsaw Jewish Ghetto uprising of 1943. Another was Gestapo chief of Düsseldorf Joachim Daumling, who organised President Nasser's security service on the lines of the SS... that is, the Nazi one, not the Jewish. The list, as we have already seen (See Chapter 6), amounts to some six thousand in all, including. Islam convert and *Mein Kampf* translator, SS officer Louis Islam (sic), who served in Egypt's press office, possibly the same press office that Paulin used to advertise his homicidal hatred of the Jews

Poor Paulin. If he wasn't such a wretched case of anti-Semitic low life, one might almost feel pity for the ludicrous situation he had placed himself in, sounding off against the 'Zionist SS' in a country that had translated and published both Arabic versions of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (sales in excess of one million and into its seventh edition by 1999, whose President, Anwar Sadat, publicly venerated its author, and

whose national hero, President Nasser, shared Hitler's belief in the truth of the *Protocols*; in a country which promoted this work at Cairo book fairs and in TV dramatisations and, finally, for decades, had employed the services of former SS Jew killers. Paulin had also given his unsolicited advice to the enemies of Israel on how to bring about the Jewish state's destruction. He had no issue with the morality of suicide bombers blowing up Jewish civilians: 'I can understand how suicide bombers feel. It is an expression of deep injustice and tragedy. [Not apparently, of a hatred for Jews or desire to savour the rewards of the Islamic Paradise.] I think, though it is better [sic] to resort to conventional guerrilla warfare. I think that attacks on civilians boost [Jewish] morale.' 'Better' only because it was a more effective way of killing Jews. Accused of being an anti-Semite after making these comments, Paulin, like others of a similar disposition, of course denied being any such thing. Following his outbursts, Paulin continued to appear on BBC TV screens. Had Paulin's invective been directed against any other ethnic group, one can be certain that his broadcasting, and also, probably, his academic career, would have been abruptly terminated.

Paulin's unequivocal statement that Israeli Jews 'are Nazis' raises several interesting questions, some of which I discuss in Appendix A, *Are Zionists Nazis?* There was a time, now distant, when a general consensus prevailed amongst the historically and politically informed that the core features of Nazism, its ruling, driving obsessions, were its determination to abolish Weimar democracy, make Germany the dominant power in Europe, crush the German worker's movement and, pre-eminently, solve what it called 'the Jewish question'. However, if indeed it is the case, as not only Paulin, but others of a like mind claim, that Israel is a Nazi state, it needs to be explained how Israel, which unlike the entire Muslim world, has a multi-party democracy and a powerful workers' movement, and is not in the business of becoming the dominant power in the Middle East or exterminating its own Jews any more than it is the Palestinians, can be made to conform to this definition. But since it is never clearly explained in what sense Zionist Jews are Nazis, we are left to make our own deductions. The most obvious answer must be, given the context in which the term is used, is that Zionists are Nazis not because Israel is a totalitarian state, which not even its most fanatical enemies, many themselves totalitarians of one kind or another, have claimed, but because they are judged to be guilty of the genocide of the Palestinians. But it follows that if 'Nazi' is now simply another term for genocidist, then it should be applied to all those guilty of the same crime. However, it never is. Just to take one example of many, in the Rwanda genocide of 1994, no-one, so far as I am aware, described those Hutus guilty of slaughtering between a half and one million Tutsis as 'Nazis'. Today, only Israeli Jews, who have committed no remotely comparable crimes, qualify as such. Those Muslims responsible for the Turkish genocide of the Armenians are never described as Nazis, any more than are the Spanish colonists whose arrival led to the deaths of the majority of the native populations of much of central and South America, or likewise, the arrival of English settlers in Australia and New Zealand in relation to their aborigines. (English colonists virtually exterminated the entire native population of Tasmania in the so-called 'Black War' of 1825 to 1831). Saddam's gassing of Kurds was not described as Nazi war crime, anyone than were Serbian 'ethnic cleansings' in the Balkan wars of the 1990s, or were first Yeltsin's then Putin's onslaughts on the Muslims of Chechnya. None of these crimes, some of which at least can reasonably be called

genocides, has been described as the work of 'Nazis', or likened to the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews. But a fictitious Israeli genocide of the Palestinians has. Why so? Because its alleged perpetrators are Jews.

In the same way, although the word genocide denotes policies and actions aimed at the extermination of a racial or ethnic group, and is used in that sense by the Sharia left and Muslim clerics and politicians when, as in the Cairo Declaration of December 18-19, 2002 endorsed by Corbyn, they accuse Israel of committing, quote, 'genocidal crimes' against the Palestinians, it is never applied to Article Seven of the 1988 Hamas Covenant, which explicitly calls for the total extermination of the Jews, or the statement by another of Jeremy Corbyn's 'friends', the Hezbollah leader Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah, that 'if all the Jews gather in Israel, it will save us the trouble of going after them worldwide.'

A typical case of BBC bias against Jews, one so outrageous that it was obliged to issue a public apology, was the broadcasting of recitations of anti-Israeli poems during the interval of two Promenade Concerts in 2002, one of which, following an already well-trodden path, likened Israel to Nazi Germany, and asked why the Jews had 'not learnt their lesson', presumably that of the Holocaust. Incredibly, in the 2015 Proms season, the BBC again found itself having to make a similar apology, this time for reproducing in the concert's programme a viciously anti-Semitic cartoon depicting a famous 19th century Russian Jewish violinist, featuring, as always, the *Der Sturmer*-style enormous hooked nose.

Some BBC reporters covering events involving Jews have demonstrably failed to comply with the requirement to be objective that one traditionally associates with the corporation. One such, Mayssaa Abdul Khalek, who on social media had posted a call for 'death to Israel', in a live BBC report in May 2021 described a Hezbollah rocket attack on northern Israel as one on, quote, 'occupied Palestine'. Then there was the case of the BBC's long-serving Gaza correspondent, Faya Abu Shamala, declaiming to a Hamas rally in May 2001 that 'journalists and media organisations are waging the campaign [that is, against Israel] shoulder to shoulder with the Palestinian people'. Really? Were they? Remember, this was a BBC reporter talking. What was he doing addressing a Hamas rally, a movement banned in the UK for its terrorism and one, moreover, dedicated to the extermination of the Jews? What had happened to the BBC's legal requirement to uphold impartiality? He was also found at the same time to have been using fake footage of Israeli soldiers committing war crimes.

Another Muslim broadcaster regularly featured on the BBC's Arabic service, Abdel Bari Atwan, described a terrorist bombing attack in Jerusalem that killed two Jews and injured 19 as the 'Palestinian World Cup' and 'a miracle', and praised the terrorists who carried it out as 'martyrs'. (The BBC is not the only news organisation to have served as a publicity vehicle for pro-Jihadis. Thompson Reuters had to strip Palestinian journalist Shatha Hammad of her 2022 Local Reporter Award after her pro-Nazi postings had come to light. One read: 'Me and Hitler are friends. We have influence over each other and share the same ideology, such as the extermination of the Jews.' As I say elsewhere, but in a similar context, Hitler is a Muslim hero.

On May 5, 2022, after representations by a range of politicians from across the political spectrum, the BBC apologised for repeatedly describing Jewish Israeli citizens as 'settlers' in its coverage of disturbances at Jerusalem's Temple Mount. An identical apology was also forthcoming from the BBC for referring 16 times

to Tel Aviv as the capital of Israel, and not Jerusalem. A similar complaint was made to the BBC concerning a programme on clashes between Israeli forces and invading Palestinians along the border of the Gaza Strip in December 2019. When, on six occasions, Palestinian interviewees made hostile references to the Jews, the Arabic word for Jew or Jews, *Yahudi*, or plural, *Yahud*, was *each time* mistranslated as 'Israeli', which could also apply just as easily to Israeli Arabs, thereby divesting its use, given its context, of its racist connotations.

On October 8, 2021, BBC 4 began the screening of an 8-part drama series, *Paris Police 1900*. It began with the return to France from Devil's Island of Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish French army officer wrongly convicted at a court martial in 1894 of spying for Germany. Evidence had come light proving his innocence. With the army high command unwilling to admit that a grievous miscarriage of justice had been committed, another court martial again found him guilty, but the President of France pardoned him, and in 1906, he was re-instated as a major, although still technically guilty of treason. It took best part of a century for the French army to officially acknowledged his innocence. The Dreyfus Affair as it was known divided France politically, with the catholic church, the monarchist upper classes, the army elite and the professional anti-semites ranged against the left, republicans, secularists and liberals. With mobs taking to the streets chanting 'death to the Jews', it also saw the birth of the modern Zionist movement. In recognition and honour of his steadfastness in the face of one of the most appalling miscarriages of justice in modern history, Dreyfus is one of the two dedicatees of this book.

Today, the universal consensus of historians is that the innocence of Dreyfus is beyond all doubt. This being so, why then did the BBC advertise the first episode with the following: 'French period crime drama. The French Republic is in turmoil as rumours spread about the release from Devil's Island of Dreyfus, *the notorious Jewish spy*.' (Emphasis added) Not 'alleged', not 'wrongly accused', just 'the notorious Jewish spy.' Isn't there enough hostility towards the Jews today without the BBC adding yet more fuel to the flames? The *Jewish Chronicle* was naturally outraged, and the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism said it would be lodging a complaint with the BBC. However, the *Guardian* saw nothing amiss. Clearly using the same promo material that provoked these two responses, its TV page of October 9 carried the headline, 'TV tonight: a classy, raunchy new French thriller', and below it, a reproduction of the BBC 4 photo of the leading actor which accompanied the reference to Dreyfus as a 'notorious Jewish spy'. Had the same channel screened a series on another infamous miscarriage of justice, that of nine young black American men wrongly convicted in 1931 of the rape of two white women - the so-called Scottsboro case - we can I think safely assume that the blurb would not have referred to 'nine notorious black rapists'. But if it had, we can be certain that the *Guardian* would have been no less outraged than was the *Jewish Chronicle* about the slandering of Dreyfus. As with the repeated omission of the Jews from Sharia left lists of victims of the Nazis, it would be naïve in the extreme to dismiss these repeated occurrences of anti-Israel bias as 'mistakes', as it would one also committed by LBC, who in May 2022 were found in breach of broadcasting regulations by Ofcom by describing, *nine times*, the Israeli embassy as 'the 'Jewish embassy' in three reports of demonstrations against Israel during the Gaza conflict of 2021.

The above cases I have cited are clear evidence of a bias, conscious or otherwise, against the Jews. We have the reverse when it comes to Muslims,

among who are numbered among some of their most fanatical enemies. Operating on the principle explored by George Orwell in his *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, that by banning the use of certain words, the meaning they express can be erased from the human mind, a new vocabulary has been devised by the more politically correct media, especially the BBC, to separate in the public mind any connection between atrocities committed by Muslims explicitly in the name of Islam from the religion of the perpetrators. Thus we have the recently coined word, 'Islamist' instead of Islamic or Muslim. To demonstrate what nonsense this subterfuge is, the Christian equivalent, perhaps describing a Bible literalist or a homicidal Catholic anti-abortionist, would be 'Christianist' or, alternatively, 'Christianityist'. Then we have 'Islamism', with the Christian equivalent being 'Christianityism'. This could be extended to 'extremists' or 'fundamentalists' of other religions; for example, Hindu supremacists would become 'Hinduists' promoting 'Hinduismism'. And so on. You get the idea? Muslim suicide bombers who blow themselves up in restaurants, mosques, and churches, tube trains, on buses and in crowded markets, slaughtering and maiming by the score as they ascend to Paradise, erection at the ready, are 'bombers', while Jihadists who massacre, kidnap, behead and crucify by the thousand are, and again I quote, 'gunmen', 'fighters', 'extremists', 'insurgents' or 'militants', this last, just like trade unionists. Ultra-reactionary clerics who preach a return to the seventh century or who invoke passages in the *Koran* to incite hatred and genocide against Jews, are described variously as 'fundamentalists', 'radicals' and 'conservatives'. What we can be sure of is that we are meant to think that none of the above is a common or garden, entirely 'orthodox' Muslim.

To illustrate the practise now prevalent, here is a classic online example of BBC *dhimmispeak*: December 18, 2014: 'Militants [sic] have stormed a remote village in North East Nigeria, killing at least 35 people and kidnapping at least 100'. The report concludes: 'More than 2,000 people have been killed in militant [sic] violence [in Nigeria] this year alone'. (Both totals were wrong. The number of women kidnapped and destined for sex slavery was in fact 172, and the number of people killed in 2014 was around 10,000.) Anyone not *au fait* with the Jihadi madness, murder, and mayhem that was engulfing north east Nigeria would have understandably been left speculating as to the identity and motivation of these 'militants', because the report, obviously produced according to BBC 'guidelines' on the subject, saw to it that there was not even a clue supplied as to their religious identity. Neither the words 'Muslim' or 'Islam', or the latter's derivatives, occurred even once in the entire report. For any number of valid reasons, one would have thought that a movement responsible for killing 'over two thousand people', and abducting scores of girls and women as sex slaves in less than a year needed to be accurately identified with as much information as was available. 'Militant' told the public nothing, and it was meant to. No such reticence or obfuscation operates when the BBC reports on deaths attributed to the Israeli military.

On Friday, January 30, 2015, a Sunni Muslim suicide bomber blew himself up in a Pakistan mosque, killing 61 fellow Muslims, Shia's at prayer. Nothing unusual in that, you might say. Neither was there in the BBC's online coverage, which reported the massacre as the work of a 'Sunni militant'. Surely this qualified as an act of terror, and the perpetrator as a terrorist? And if it didn't, what did? A few days previously, with reference to BBC coverage of the *Charlie Hebdo* killings, Tarik Kafala, head of BBC Arabic, explained why the term 'terrorist' had been excluded from general BBC usage. The word was 'too loaded', he explained. 'Loaded' with

what? I would say, accuracy. And yet, while banning the use of the word, except when quoting others who do, the BBC guidelines 'recognise the existence and [sic] reality of terrorism'. So what happened to 'too loaded'? Just what was going on here? If terrorist acts 'exist' and are 'real' and what is more, an almost daily occurrence, why not use the correct word to describe them? Could it be that it might upset the BBC's Muslim viewers and listeners? But what else are we to call Islamic fanatics who video themselves beheading their victims, blow themselves up on a London Tube train and bus, in Mosques, markets or restaurants, fly planes into buildings, bury children alive, murder, abduct, auction and then rape schoolgirls and the rest? Kafala had the answer. The *Charlie Hebdo* massacre (another 'too loaded' term?) should be described thus: 'Two men killed twelve people in an attack on an office of a satirical magazine'. 'That', said Kafala 'is enough'. Any more, and all-too-easily offended Muslims would be complaining - that is, if they were not busy celebrating. According to a poll reported by the BCC, 27% of UK Muslims approved of the massacre. In the USA, it was 29%. One can only speculate about the level of support in Islamic countries. But common sense suggests it would not have been lower.

The day after the 2016 Nice Bastille Day massacre, the BBC TV 24-hour news service invited what viewers were given to understand was an expert on Arab-French relations to provide background on the perpetrator of the atrocity. Viewers were told his age, 31, that he was born in Tunisia, but had moved to France, and that his profile was 'predictable'. Could the expert be implying by 'predictable' that he was a Muslim? After all, his first name was Mohammed, like the Orlando gay club assassin. He was known to be a wife beater, and by origin to be an Arab from an Islamic country. Then there were the facts that that the massacre took place on France's National Day, and that all similar recent terrorist attacks not only in France but across the world had been carried out by Muslims. The BBC's politically correct alarm bells rang. The expert was stopped in her tracks and pressed to explain what she meant by 'predictable'. The fears proved groundless. By 'predictable' she was referring to his criminal record, and the fact he was known to the police, a description so lacking in precision that it could apply to countless numbers of people who have had no sympathy for or connection with terrorism, and does not fit many who have. As to his motives...who could say? And so the coverage tip-toed on, with never a mention of the forbidden M or I words.

One wonders how the rules imposed by the BBC Word Police would have played out had they been in force when its reporters described the scenes they witnessed at the liberation of Nazi death camps at the end of the Second World War. The questions all journalists are trained and paid to ask and, if they can, answer - When? Where? What? Why? Who? - remained, in the case of the *Charlie Hebdo* killings, unanswered and, one suspects, for political reasons, unasked. For those who had access to other sources of information than the BBC's Arabic service, it was with very little effort possible to know the answers to all these questions. Why the *Charlie Hebdo* killings? The perpetrators told us...to avenge the prophet. Yes, but again, why? They were Muslims, and the penalty for insulting their prophet is death. And why that particular magazine? Because it lampooned Islam and its prophet...and so on. You see, it's not so difficult. Yet by the accepted standards of news reporting, including those of the BBC when they do not involve Islam, the BBC's Arabic coverage of the Paris massacres, if Tariq Kafala will permit the word, was far from 'enough'. No terrorism, no Islam, just a shoot-out where two, for no

apparent reason kill 12, just as President Obama described the deliberate murder of four Jews in a kosher supermarket on the same day as a ‘random [sic!] shooting at a bunch of folks [sic] in a deli in Paris’. But when Israeli forces clashed with Hamas in the summer of 2014, and again in 2021, the BBC’s coverage, and vocabulary was less parsimonious.

On the evening of November 29, 2021, a bus load of Jewish school children arrived in Oxford Street, London. As a treat, they had come to the West End to celebrate the Jewish festival of Hanukkah. As they danced, sang and clapped their hands in the street, they were accosted, jostled and insulted by a group of young men, who chanted ‘Free Palestine’ and made Hitler salutes. When the children retreated back into their bus, their assailants spat at and hammered on its windows with their shoes, a traditional gesture of Muslim hatred. While, understandably, there were no press or TV witnesses to the attack, it was covered by the media over the next few days.

Despite the ample evidence that they were his co-religionists, one freelance Muslim journalist, though not being a witness to the incident, nevertheless claimed the attack had been staged by ‘British far right scum’, while a BBC on-line report, based on external sources, after describing the incident in some detail, concluded with the claim that children in the bus had provoked the attack by using insulting language towards their assailants, one calling out ‘dirty Muslim’. Adult school staff on the bus denied this, and made a complaint to this effect to the BBC. The BBC replied that the section of the report making this allegation had been added to the text by editorial staff, according to the *Jewish Chronicle*, ‘at very senior management level’...an extraordinary and indeed sinister admission. This would explain why the BBC, though under considerable pressure not to do so, stood by the report’s accuracy, even though it did not provide proof of its accusation. So much for Corbyn’s claim that the BBC took its orders from the Israeli embassy. After being slowed down, ‘cleaned up’ and then listened to by an expert in Hebrew, a video of the entire incident, which the BBC had cited as evidence of its accusation, established that it had recorded a Jewish girl’s voice inside the bus asking for help, in Hebrew, but no insults, either in Hebrew or English. (Even if she had insulted the attackers, it would have been in a language they could not have possibly understood.) Unlike the BBC, the police were satisfied that no ‘hate’ speech’ crime had been committed by the children, saying they were only interested in apprehending the attackers, whose facial images, while most certainly of ‘scum’, but not of ‘British far right’ complexion, were also recorded on the video. The following evening, the bus returned to Oxford Street, *this time with a police escort*. As I write this, I feel a deep sense of shame and anger. Need I explain why?

After an internal investigation of the affair, the BBC rejected the claim that its reportage had involved ‘victim blaming’ (it palpably did) but conceded that ‘more could have been done, subsequent to the report, to acknowledge the differing views [sic] and opinions in relation to what was said; this should have been reflected in our reporting, and the online article amended. We accept this, and apologise for not doing more to highlight that these details were contested – we should have reflected this and acted sooner.’ But the BBC did not, and in view of the BBC’s spotted track record on reporting matter Jewish, there are reasonable grounds for suspecting why this was so.

On January 4, 2022, the *Jewish Chronicle* reported that Rabbi YY Rubinstein, a broadcaster with the BBC for thirty years, had resigned from the corporation in

protest against its bias against Jews. Citing its coverage of the Oxford Street incident, Rabbi Rubinstein said that 'I simply don't see how I or in fact any Jew who has any pride in that name can be associated with the Corporation anymore.' Perhaps he was missing something, because Comrade Corbyn believed that the BBC took its orders from the Israeli embassy. It certainly did not when, in an hour-long programme on Radio Three devoted to the hundredth anniversary of the publication of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in 1922, no mention was made of the fact that its central character, Leopold Bloom, was a Jew and that several of its key episodes revolved around this identity. I find this extraordinary, to say the least.

When on the rare occasions TV programme makers dare to show to viewers the dark side of modern Islam, they run the risk of prosecution under the UK's thought crime laws. In January 2007, the Channel Four Programme *Dispatches* secretly filmed Muslim preachers in full flow at a number of Mosques. At the Green Lane Mosque in Birmingham, imam Abu Usama was filmed describing women as 'deficient', and making the following comments about homosexuals: 'Take that homosexual man and throw him off the mountain. If I were to call homosexuals perverted, dirty, filthy dogs who should be murdered, that's my freedom of speech, isn't it?' - yet another case of Muslim 'one way street' free speech. These statements, viewed on the nation's TV screens, not only are now but were at the time they were made, actionable under a number of hate speech laws. However, no such proceedings ensued, at least, not against imam Usama. No doubt taken aback when his misogynistic and homophobic rantings were made public, the preacher demanded that the police 'should indict the people of Channel Four, the people who put forward this *Dispatches* programme'. Always on their guard, like other police authorities, to avoid any actions that might put at risk 'community cohesion', West Midlands Police dutifully sprang into action with an alacrity that was conspicuously absent when it came to investigating well-founded allegations of the grooming, trafficking, pimping and gang rape of children by Muslim men in Telford. (See Chapter 27)

The result was an *eight months'* inquiry into what the Crown Prosecution Service claimed was Channel Four's 'distortion' and 'heavy editing' of preachers' sermons, which had allegedly been taken 'out of context' (yet again). However, 'heavy' the editing and whatever the 'context' (as it happened, a sermon in a mosque), the fact remained that Abu Usama, along with other preachers no less forthright, had indeed made the statements attributed to him. Unable to deny this, he resorted to the usual tactic in such situations of claiming that he had been 'misconstrued'. How else can one 'construe' the statements such as that women are deficient and homosexuals are dogs that should be killed, other than women are deficient and homosexuals are dogs that should be killed? As with the Koranic verse that explicitly sanctions wife beating, how can these two statements be 'construed' to yield any other than the meanings their words give them? Unless of course, we have again a Koranic code in play. Other examples of 'out of context', 'misconstrued' and 'heavily edited' Islamic sermonising screened in the programme included a preacher at the Derby Ahle-Hadith mosque, Dr. [sic] Izaz Mian, advocating the establishment of a religious police in the UK that would enforce attendance by Muslims at Friday prayers. (Something former Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams would no doubt have approved of.) He warned, 'if you don't come for prayer, we will arrest you. But, if you still don't, you will be killed'. How does one go about 'misconstruing' this? Another preacher advocated

beating Muslim women who refused to wear the hijab, while yet another praised the beheading of a British serviceman by the Taliban: 'The hero is the one who severs his head from his shoulders'. (As per *Koran*, Chapter 8, Verse 12) Under Sharia law, violence and killing, especially by decapitation, seem to be the answer to just about everything. Back in Birmingham, in the car park of the Green Lane mosque, the programme showed videos on sale which featured preacher Sheikh Fez explaining to Muslim parents how they should rear their children for *Jihad* and martyrdom: 'We want to have children and offer them as soldiers defending Islam. Tell them this: that there is nothing more beloved to me than wanting to die as a *Mujahidin*. Put in their soft tender hearts the zeal for *Jihad* and the love of martyrdom'. See how Islam can be misconstrued! Never was a faith, and its holy book, so often (and it must be said so easily) misunderstood. All it takes is some 'heavy editing' and a wrong 'context' and sermons such as this, which on a correct reading clearly advocate tolerance, peace and love can, by the sleight of the *kuffar's* hand, be transformed into ones of bigotry, war and hate.

Such was gist of the extraordinary claim made by Bethan David of the CPS, who accused Channel Four of having 'completely [sic] distorted' sermons that were, if she did but know it, in content no different from those preached by imams in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Had Channel Four aired a programme that secretly filmed not, as on this occasion, a religious far-rightist meeting but a secular one, where speakers abused in similar manner blacks, gays and Muslims, it is a pretty sure bet firstly that no police and CPS accusations of 'heavy editing', 'taking out of context', 'misconstruing' and 'complete distortion' would have been made and, secondly, that those who made the comments, not those who recorded them, would be the subject of investigation and in all probability, prosecution.. Despite months of scrutiny of the evidence, in none of the screened statements was either the CPS or Abu Usama able to provide the correct, 'in context', non 'distorted', properly 'construed', un 'heavily edited' meaning of these expositions of Muslim theology, which go down so well in a mosque but don't look and sound quite as good when viewed on the UK's TV screens by a largely infidel audience. So, applying the maxim that the best means of defence is attack, the traduced preacher then charged the makers of the programme with 'trying to undermine the cohesion of the [Muslim] community'. Yet again, the Muslim as victim. And of a conspiracy, no less. But how exactly? By whom? And why? As for the police and the CPS, after *eight months*' worth of public money wasted on repeated viewings of the programme, the interrogation of its makers and compiling statements from suitably outraged Muslims, all at the behest of Jihadist, segregationist, homophobic, misogynistic imams, the decision was reached, much no doubt to the chagrin of the Islamic offence industry, that there was no case to answer. But the point had been made. Programme makers, if you know what is good for you, don't mess with the Muslims.

In recent years, some on the far left have drifted into the Green Party, possibly attracted by the organisation's rapid growth and electoral successes, and frustrated by the decline of their own. The result was the adoption by the Green Party, already inclined to anti-Zionism, of an increasingly strident anti-Israeli stance, to the extent that some members complained of what one described as the party's 'institutionalised anti-Semitism'. Neither was the charge groundless. Members had been circulating anti-Semitic emails, including articles from the press of the Neo Nazi British National Party and the writings of the notorious US anti-Zionist

campaigner, Holocaust denier, Hitler admirer, former Ku Klux Klan Grand Wizard and Corbyn enthusiast David Duke. (such are the literary preferences of today's far left) Another member posted on the party's internal forum a venomous attack on the Board of Deputies of British Jews, demanding that 'we must smash the Zionists', while a Green Party local councillor cited approvingly on-line the demand by the anti-Israel campaigner Gilad Atzmon that Britain must 'de-Zionise' itself, or as the Nazis put it, become *Judenfrei*. At the time of the Iraq conflict of 2003, the party affiliated to the Stop the War Coalition, while during the 2014 Gaza war, members carried 'We Are All Hamas Now' placards on anti-Israeli demonstrations, either not knowing, or caring, that Hamas advocated the extermination of all Jews. This was the company the Green Party, along with the rest of the anti-Zionist industry, Muslim and infidel alike, chose to keep. Endorsing the boycott Israel campaign, another Green Party member ventured the opinion that Jewish academics were 'not part of the civilised world', (presumably unlike Saudi clerics who claim the earth is flat), while another dredged up Duke's charge that Israel was guilty of the 'genocide' of the Palestinians. Anyone in the Green Party critical of such opinions ran the risk of being accused of being a 'Nazi [sic!] infiltrator,' not only a standard tactic of the Sharia left, but one also redolent of 1930s Stalinism, which routinely slandered all its left-wing opponents in exactly the same way. (Of course, it is all too easy to spot Nazis. Everybody knows how they go around complaining about anti-Semitism)

The Welsh Green Party leader, entrepreneur Pippa Bartolotti, pursued her party's anti-western foreign policy with some vigour. At an anti-NATO rally in Newport in 2014, just as Corbyn had done, she excused Putin's annexation of the Crimea as a defensive reaction to what she regarded as a NATO-led western expansionism. As to the Middle East, she posed for a photo with the Swastika-style flag of the neo-Nazi Syrian Social Nationalist Party, and claimed that in Syria, 'they call me Mujahidin'. In 2012, visiting Gaza, fast becoming the new tourist hot-spot for Sharia lefties, she met Hamas leader Mahmoud al-Zahar, whose advocacy of terrorism against Israel included the killing of Jewish children anywhere in the world. Bartolotti's attitude towards Jews, though not homicidal or genocidal like that of Hamas, was not exactly positive either. She objected to the UK being represented in Israel by a 'Jewish-Zionist' ambassador, claiming that 'from the university of life [sic], I have learned that Jews often have conflicts of interest in matters relating to Palestine.' But of course, Muslims did not. UK Green Party leader Natalie Bennet likewise favoured close links with Jihadist movements and toeing the Sharia left line of a total boycott of Israel. As for Islamic terrorism, like Putin's annexations, it had to be understood as a response to 'ill-advised [western] military interventions'. This had of course also been the standard Corbynista explanation. In the light of such policies and statements, it is not hard to see why internally, hostility towards the Jews was given a free reign, not only amongst the Green's rank and file, but the party chiefs. When members accused the party leadership of 'turning a blind eye' to anti-Semitism (again, exactly the same charge that was later to be levelled, with equal justice, against Labour Leader Corbyn) it adopted the time-honoured tactic of setting up a committee of loyalists to investigate the matter (yet again, just like Corbyn) with the usual intended and predictable results (and yes, yet again, just like Corbyn.). Resignations then followed. One of the party top brass, Martin Deane, summed up his response to the accusations with the astonishing comment that 'to be accused of anti-Semitism is a

sign we're probably doing something right.' It needs to be stressed that this remark came from an official of a party which, unlike those of the traditional far left, had elected representatives at the levels of local government, devolved assembly, the Westminster and European Parliaments, and at times attracted the support of as much as 10% of the UK electorate.

Following the General Election of May 2015, many Green Party members switched their loyalties to Labour to vote for Corbyn in the three-pound franchise bequeathed to the party by its departing leader Ed Miliband, thereby boosting its already burgeoning anti-Zionist and indeed, anti-Semitic membership. Just how committed the Green Party was to its anti-Zionist agenda was demonstrated when in October 2015, delegates at its Scottish Conference adopted a resolution condemning Israel for what it called its 'systematic violations of international law' and 'perpetuating the racist ideology of modern-day Zionism'. Despite opposition from some delegates, the Conference also voted for Hamas to be removed from its listing as a terrorist organisation.

As for Zionism being 'racist', where, in the teachings of its founders, or the legislation of any Israeli government, is there to be found evidence of any denigration of any other people or ethnic group, or the claim made that the Jews constitute a superior race to any other? That a small minority of individual Israeli Jews harbour such feelings towards Palestinians and in rare cases, criminally act upon, them is not in dispute. But with Hamas, Jew hatred is the official policy, and when acted upon, results not, as in Israel, in prosecution and conviction, but celebration, commemoration and reward. These crucial differences arise from the fact that as we have seen, Palestinians, from a very early age, are indoctrinated into a very special kind of racism, which like that of the Nazis, regards the Jews not as human beings at all, however inferior, but as entirely different species, sub-humans, or as the *Koran* puts it so eloquently, 'apes and swine'. But the hatred does not stop there. Its sole purpose is to inculcate the mentality necessary to see the killing of such sub-humans as both a sacred duty and honour, which when it is acted upon to kidnap and murder Israeli civilians, must surely constitute a 'violation of international law' the Greens pretended to be so concerned to uphold. And what is even more to the point, nowhere was this racist, genocidal incitement conducted with more fanaticism than in the Gaza Strip by the leaders of the very movement the Scottish Greens wished to see removed from any list of terrorist organisations, a movement which quite openly proclaimed its intention of exterminating the Jews in Article Seven of its Covenant. Make of these contradictions what you will.

Ironically, the Green Party's Jihadi sympathies resulted in a flagrantly opportunist accommodation with Islam in a policy area which should have been its *metier*. Challenged by members to explain why their party did not oppose ritual slaughter, the Head Office's reply not only insisted that the barbaric Islamic method of slaughter was more humane than conventional legal methods that unlike the Islamic, use stunning. He actually recommended an Islamic text on the subject as proof of this claim. Anyone who has managed to watch to the end a video of a Muslim slaughter house in action as I have will know that this is a lie. So here we have one more discarded shibboleth to add to all the others. Given the Green Party's Sharia affinities, it should have come as no surprise when it was discovered that amongst the 300,000 or so who joined the Labour Party to vote for the Sharia left endorsed leadership candidate Jeremy Corbyn, a sizable number had voted Green at the 2015 General Election.

Finally, Sharia Tartans. Like some other nationalist movements, the animus of the Scottish can be directed not only against those it sees as its immediate enemy, in this case the English, but also the Jews. When a Scottish National Party member posted an anti-Semitic cartoon depicting a sow emblazoned with the word 'Rothschild' suckling piglets representing various Jihadist movements, the message should have been obvious...not Muslims, but the Jews were responsible for the rise of what the uninformed took to be Islamic terrorism. Sandra White, SNP member of the Scottish Parliament, obviously thought so too, so she re-recycled it, while SNP Westminster MP Paul Monaghan tweeted that what he called 'the proud Jewish race' were guilty of 'persecuting the people of Gaza'. SNP leader Nicola Sturgeon, while distancing herself from such comments, still spoke at a 'Women for Gaza' rally in Glasgow alongside Muslim convert Yvonne Ridley of George Galloway's 'Respect', notorious (among non-anti-Semites) for her call for a 'Zionist free Scotland'. Unless she had in mind a Zionist genocide, one can only assume that all of Scotland's Zionist Jews (and there were, as is the norm, very few of its 6,000 Jews who were not) were to be rounded up and dumped over the border into England. As elsewhere in the UK, the number of recorded anti-Semitic incidents in Scotland was on the rise, including Nazi style-boycotts of Jewish-owned shops, which the rabidly anti-Zionist SNP at the very least had done nothing to curb. Following Sturgeon's resignation in February 2023, it was discovered that one of the candidates to replace her, the Muslim Health Secretary Humza Yusef, had previously had dealings with Hamas leader Mohammad Sawalha when they met at a pro Gaza Edinburgh event in 2008 attended by Scottish government officials and politicians. Also present was anti-Semite Baroness Tonge, then a still a Liberal Democrat peer, who true to form, offered the observation that the US 'Jewish lobby' was 'making all parties obey the will of Israel.'

How and in what *milieu* the Sharia left operates is best demonstrated by its leading role in three organisations, each of which has a prominent Islamic dimension; Unite Against Fascism, the Stop the War Coalition and the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign. As we have seen, the first is in every sense a classic Stalinist-style popular front, administered by two SWP officials. One of its two joint secretaries, Weyman Bennett, is notorious for declaring at a pro-Hamas rally that that Israeli Jews 'should go back to where they came from...New York or wherever.' UAF's Assistant Secretary Martin Smith was until 2012 National Secretary of the SWP, when he was, reluctantly, removed, like his WRP counterpart Healy, on charges of sexual misconduct, after accusations of rape were brought against him and other party leaders by women party members. (Could it be that the SWP's readiness to accommodate Islam's degradation of women has had repercussions within its own ranks? Can it be sheer coincidence that when a SWP rape victim describes the party as a 'dangerous environment to be in', exactly the same can be said of a female's life under Islam?)

Despite its name, and initially being founded to combat the fascist British National Party, UAF increasingly devoted more of its energies to promoting a positive image of Islam, with the result that it was itself accused by others on the left of turning a blind eye to Islamic fascism and of collaboration with Muslim individuals and organisations that harbour Nazi-type prejudices against the Jews and quite openly idolise Hitler. The human rights campaigner Peter Tatchell, who is nobody's useful idiot, said Unite against Fascism was 'silent about Islamic fascists who promote anti-Semitism, homophobia and sexism, and sectarian attacks

on non-extremist Muslims.’ In the case of Corbyn, it was worse than silence. He had gone out of his way to defend, host, befriend and praise them, adding selective anti-fascism to his many other selective solidarity campaigns and peace-making. One of UAF's Vice Presidents was the similarly selective anti-racist Ken Livingstone, an admirer, host and promoter of the Hitler-loving Muslim cleric al-Qaradawi. As noted previously, Livingstone, together with fellow anti-Zionists Corbyn and Galloway, was paid by Iran Press TV to host its English language broadcasts, thus serving as employees of a brutal Islamic regime that regularly executes its victims, many of them Kurds and secular leftists, by publicly hanging them from cranes in batches. In proportion to its population, Iran has far and away the highest execution rate in the world. Yet Livingstone was, like Corbyn, on record as being unconditionally opposed to capital punishment.

One of the great achievements of Livingstone's squalid political career has been to accomplish what Orwell only described in fiction, namely sustaining simultaneously two sets of totally incompatible political positions, firstly, between his opposition to the death penalty while being prepared to take up paid employment for a regime that is easily the world's most prolific executioner, and secondly, his well-advertised anti-racism on the one hand, being Vice President of Unite against Fascism, and on the other, his unqualified endorsement of the Hitler-admiring, anti-Semitic cleric Yusuf al-Qaradawi. In fact, throughout his political career, Livingstone time and again had proved that when it came to his political associations, 2 plus 2 could indeed simultaneously equal 4 and 5, surely the hallmark of a consummate populist no less than an amoral charlatan. Because here we had an example of unbridled political opportunism, cynicism and hypocrisy unrivalled on the UK political scene. In an earlier life, Livingstone, along with Corbyn a key figure in numerous popular front operations, initially raised his political profile as a pioneer of the cross-class, multi-ethnic (save for Jews) ‘rainbow coalition’, a champion of ethnic minority, gay and women's rights and any number of flavour of the moment causes. However, like all Sharia leftists, in matters concerning the Middle East and Iran, other considerations than the rights of homosexuals, ethnic and religious minorities and women came into play. Being gay, emancipated and demonstrating for this and that was all very well in London, but one had to understand (and as we have seen, Sharia feminists for one did) that for reasons that were regarded as entirely valid, things could not be quite the same where and when the laws of Allah applied. Rather than criticise repressive policies and actions that, if pursued in the UK, would be roundly and rightly condemned, the priority was to see the bigger picture, to take care not to fall into the trap of unwittingly serving the interests of western imperialism and Zionism by raising, with regimes deemed to be taking a stand against them, human rights issues, or condemning atrocities perpetrated by any number of Jihadi terrorists which in the final analysis as the saying goes, are ‘our fault’. For want of a better name, this was the Lindsey German ‘shibboleth dumping’ tactic, one that with very few exceptions, the far left adopted to preserve smooth working relations with domestic Muslim pressure groups and support abroad for Jihadi movements and Islamic regimes. As already stated, Livingstone, like Corbyn, was on record as an opponent of the death penalty, at least in western countries where, apart from 27 states in the USA, it has been abolished. But I can find no evidence of his opposition to its application in Iran, where his and Corbyn's employers notched up 560 executions just in the first six months of 2015.

In the UK, adultery is not a criminal offence, and has not been since the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 divested the Church of England of its legal powers to judge divorce cases. The last woman to be executed for adultery in England was hanged in 1654. As Livingstone, Galloway and Corbyn, each of whom served the Ayatollahs as their paid broadcasters, must surely have been aware, Amnesty International had provided documentary proof that stoning women to death for alleged sexual offences was still a routine occurrence in Iran, as it was in the Islamic State and in those parts of Afghanistan then controlled by the Taliban. But where were the protests? No less shamefully, their silence was shared by western feminists. For a half a century or more now, western women have worn bikinis on public beaches, but in the realm of Allah, even the glimpse of an ankle or a wisp of hair can earn a woman a flogging. Yet sartorial regulations imposed on their Muslim sisters only concern western feminists when they occur in non-Islamic countries, hence their 'World Hijab Day' and protests against bans on the burka and its aquatic version, the burkini.

If the allegations of torture of suspected Muslim Jihadis practised outside civil jurisdiction by the US military at Guantanamo Bay are true, then it should be condemned by all those who value the rule of law. But so far as the Sharia left is concerned, torture practised by Muslims, often on other Muslims, as it is in Iran, is another matter entirely. Take, for example, an account that appeared in *The Survivor*, the newsletter of Freedom from Torture, of torture inflicted by the Islamic pimps of Livingstone, Corbyn and Galloway on an opponent of the Iranian theocracy:

As a young man, Labib learned seven languages and studied history and economics to degree level. Following in his father's footsteps he continued to campaign for free speech and democracy until one night he was caught printing pro-democracy leaflets with friends in preparation for a demonstration. Labib was arrested and tortured for eight months in an intelligence [sic] centre. [His own account then follows]: 'I was in isolation for about three months' although I had no idea of time when I was in there. There was no toilet, no bed, they'd pour icy water on you the moment you fell asleep, put a tin on your head and bang it, beat. There is more but I don't want to go into it'.... Even to this day, what they did disturbs me. I don't believe this is the action of a human, even animals wouldn't do this.

Since the Sharia left has never protested against these vile practises (that would mean breaking the ranks of the anti-imperialist front) we must assume there are, just as Tatchell said, some fascisms, specifically of the clerical kind, that did not, in the judgment of the UAF, qualify as such. Hardly surprising, because UAFs' Vice President was Azad Ali, suspended from his post at the Treasury after declaring his support for the killing of British servicemen in Iraq by Islamo-fascist terrorists. As a supporter of Jihadism, Ali made no secret of his links with al-Qaeda. And why should he when the SWP, which refused to condemn its attack on the World Trade centre and endorsed the Jihadi terrorism of Hamas and Hezbollah, was pulling all the UAF strings? Very much in the tradition of Stalinist popular fronts, Ali was allowed to wear several political hats. One was worn in the UK for the benefit of UAF's 'useful idiots', as a defender of democracy against the menace of fascism. But he wore another, his own, when addressing the Muslim Forum of Europe: 'Democracy, if it means at the expense of not implementing Sharia, of course [sic] no one would agree with that.' Yet democracy was precisely what UAF was supposed to be defending from the threat of fascism. It is difficult to see how this

could be done when so much of its support came from Muslim organisations and individuals whose religion commands, as the *Koran* puts it, that 'the right of legislation is for none but for Allah', and which therefore obliges Muslims to reject democracy and subject themselves to theocracy.

UAF developed extremely close links with the Muslim Council of Britain, a lavishly-funded and highly organised Islamic pressure group that despite its tactical 'moderate stance' on some issues, which facilitated Government patronage and funding, nevertheless maintained close relations with the theocratic Muslim Brotherhood (whose founder, Hassan Al Banna, was an admirer of Hitler), and prominent individuals in the world of Jihadi Islam. These quite open associations did not prevent prominent Council officials from being regularly invited as guests of honour to UAF annual conferences. Since the SWP-Muslim Council of Britain alliance has been a key component of the anti-Zionist offensive in the UK, some facts about the Council's political profile are in order. Founded in 1997 and then affiliated to the Egypt-based Muslim Brotherhood, which in turn is allied to Hamas, although it has been criticised for its self-selecting, and therefore unrepresentative leadership, it was still accepted by all and sundry, from the Socialist Workers Party to UK Prime Ministers, as the authoritative voice of UK Muslims. In reality, it is the vehicle for the UK's Islamic elite, clerical, economic and political. As such, it commands huge resources, including 500 mosques, schools and associations. Aside from the finance that flows in from the oil rich Middle East despotisms, by striking a pose of 'moderation' (Islam calls such justified deception *taqiyya*) the Council also found easy access to tax payers' money, to the tune of £300,000 in 2006 alone.

However, dependency on public funding did not inhibit the Council from biting the hand that fed it by opposing government policy when Islamic interests were at stake. At the time of the Iraq war of 2003, having, like the Sharia left, never been moved to protest against Russia's onslaughts on Muslim Chechnya, or Saddam's invasion of Muslim Kuwait and genocidal war against the mainly Muslim Kurds, the Council began its collaboration with the SWP in the latter's 'Stop the War Coalition'. It also attempted to persuade Parliament to water down its anti-terrorist legalisation. Even so, public funding continued. Its moderate mask slipped completely in demands the Council made for Muslim school children in state schools. Taliban style, it wanted Muslim pupils excluded from mixed swimming, dancing, sex education, music, and art. It also wanted a ban on cross gender handshaking at prize giving ceremonies. Best of all was the demand that in visits to farms, Muslim children should be kept well away from pigs... who knows...they could be Jews.

Then of course there was Israel. From 2001 to 2007, the Council refused invitations to participate in Holocaust Memorial Day events, citing as the reason Israel's 'ongoing genocide' of the Palestinians. (20 years later, as I write, it is still 'going on'. How much longer is it going to take?) Yet still the funding continued. Evidently, some racisms were less racist than others, or even, as Livingstone said of anti-Semitism, not racist at all. The same theme was pursued when the Council's Director Daoud Abdullah attended a Shura Council convention in Istanbul in January 2009, signing a declaration expressing solidarity with the terrorist and anti-Semitic Hamas movement, and saluting what it called its 'victory' against 'Zionist and Jewish occupiers'. Here we had, clearly stated, the point and motive of convergence of pro-Jihadi, anti-Semitic Islam with the anti-Zionist left, and it helped to explain how what at first glance seemed an unlikely combination had

become such a going concern, one which necessitated the Sharia left dumping yet another 'shibboleth', traditional leftist opposition to anti-Semitism.

Here we have a classic example. The revered Qatar-based Muslim Brotherhood cleric Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi was the author of an essay with the self-explanatory title *Our War with the Jews is in the name of Islam*. A vehement enemy of Israel and as such, closely associated with both Ken Livingstone and the Muslim Council of Britain, he appeared on Al-Jazeera TV in January 2009, warning the Jews that they faced 'divine punishment' akin to Hitler's holocaust. Back in the UK, condemnation was swift and widespread, even reaching Parliament, but not Unite Against Fascism. A ban was promptly imposed on his entering the UK. In another appearance on Al-jazeera TV, in February 2013, al-Qaradawi explained why the death penalty for apostasy was not only integral to but essential for Islam: 'If they [presumably Muslim clerics] had got rid of the apostasy punishment, Islam wouldn't exist today'. Nothing if not orthodox, al-Qaradawi then explained, with a citation from the *Koran*, how Obama's religion of proud tolerance dealt with those opposed to it: 'Sura Al-Ma'ida 5:33 says: "The punishment of those who wage war against and His apostle is that they should be murdered or crucified"'. Which is, as the world by now knows, thanks to its own promotional videos, exactly how the allegedly non-Islamic Islamic State punished those it regarded as the enemies of Islam.

Islam Online, a website manned by a team of top-flight Muslim scholars, headed by al-Qaradawi, defined the universally accepted ruling on apostasy thus: 'If a sane person who has reached puberty [this could be a child no older than 10 or 11] voluntarily apostates from Islam, he deserves to be punished. In such cases, it is obligatory for the caliph (or his representative) to ask him to repent and return to Islam. If he does, it is accepted from him, but if he refuses, he is immediately killed.' al-Qaradawi's extraordinarily frank admission that Islam relies on terror to maintain its hold on its own following came from one of the most highly respected Muslim scholars in the world. As for his frequently advertised hatred of Jews and admiration of Hitler, one would have thought that the professional anti-fascists of UAF would be first in the queue to denounce him no less vehemently than it would a member of the British National Party for expressing the same views. One might suppose so, but one would be wrong, the reason being that al-Qaradawi enjoyed a close political and, one suspects, even possibly personal relationship with UAF Vice President Ken Livingstone. He was an honoured guest of the then London Mayor in 2004 and was subsequently praised by Livingstone as an 'absolutely sane Islamist' (an oxymoron if ever there was one) 'the most powerfully progressive force for change and for engaging Islam with western values' - such as killing people who change their religion. In 2007, Livingstone claimed the cleric represented 'the strongest force for the modernisation of Islam.' Two years on, and the anti-fascist Livingstone's 'powerful', 'progressive' 'modernising' al-Qaradawi was televised praising Hitler and eagerly anticipating the extermination of the Jews. In 2013, he was upholding the death penalty for apostasy. And like his SWP brothers-in-arms, al-Qaradawi had no time for the shibboleth of free speech, demanding in the wake of the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre that the United Nations adopt 'a law criminalising contempt of religions and the prophets and all the holy sites'. However, neither al-Qaradawi's reputation as an Islamic scholar, or his connections in high places, saved him from the long arm of the despised *kuffar's* secular law. Livingstone's Hitler-admiring 'strongest force for the modernisation of

Islam' was wanted by Interpol on charges of 'incitement and assistance to murder, helping prisoners to escape, arson, vandalism [sic] and theft.'

The SWP's commitment to its alliance with Jihadi Islam was so all-embracing that on one occasion it involved the party in a theological dispute between UK Muslims that culminated in a demonstration it staged jointly with the Plymouth Islamic Society against a speaker from the Quilliam Foundation, a body that almost single handedly, and in defiance of death threats, ostracism and slander by mainstream Muslim pressure groups that collaborate with the Sharia left, has made genuine and courageous, even if possibly doomed attempts to develop a pluralist interpretation of Islam. And that was precisely the problem. What had particularly aroused the ire of the demonstrators was the Foundation's admirable refusal to condemn as blasphemous the atheist on-line cartoon feature Jesus and Mo. One (infidel) opponent of the Foundation, in an on-line comment on the demonstration, found the cartoons 'highly offensive' (of course) because of their 'images of Jesus and Mohammed'. True, for nearly all Muslims, representations of their prophet are indeed blasphemous, and as we have seen, there are among them those who are prepared to kill anyone who creates or publishes them. But when it comes to Christians, and even less so, one might naively assume, SWP atheists, who among them today are 'offended' by images of Christ? And not only today. The last major outburst of Christian (in this instance Calvinist) iconoclasm erupted in Amsterdam's Oude Kirk in 1566. Had the author of this nonsense ever visited an art museum? Or a Church, both where images of Christ and his mother frequently abound? And surely, he should also have known that it was the *worshipping* of 'graven images' that the Old Testament forbad, not looking at them. Seeing that the purpose of the demonstration, which was to reassure the 'Muslim community' that the Left shared its reverence for the founder of their faith, should we be surprised that this *a la outrance* display of outraged piety was the work of one Bob Pitt, the veteran former atheist and revolutionary socialist who found a new mission as a Sharia Don Quixote, tilting against the windmills of Islamophobia. One of many targets of his 'Islamophobia Watch' website was that *bete noir* of all true believers, the atheist campaigner and biologist Richard Dawkins, singled out by Pitt for his outspoken opposition to the teaching of Creationism in schools. Since all Muslims, unlike all but a dwindling number of Christians, reject evolution and, more generally, see the function of education chiefly as means to instil Islam into the young, Dawkins' support for a truly secular educational system constituted proof of his Islamophobia.

Sharia left resistance to secularism, (yet another discarded shibboleth) particularly in the always hotly contested battlefield of education, could be taken to fanatical lengths in the quest to win the approval of the UK's Islamic pressure groups. At an annual conference of the UK's main teachers' trade union, the far left dominated National Union of Teachers, (now the National Education Union) the delegates voted down by a large majority what one would assumed would have proved an uncontentious motion advocating the secularisation of the UK's state school system, while a similar majority was secured for de-secularising it even further, by allowing access to all state schools by chaplains from the various faiths. We can sure which particular one the supporters of this motion had in mind.

Pitt's commitment to even the most barbaric of Jihadist movements was unflinching, truly something to behold. He praised the SWP for its refusal to 'use the word condemn in relation to the September 11 [2001] events [sic]' and, with a US-led retaliatory intervention in Afghanistan looming, heralded what he hoped

would prove to be a 'progressive [sic] victory' of the Taliban over the western forces. Those who did not share Pitt's enthusiasm for the Taliban's vision of an palaeolithic Islamic society he deemed guilty of 'racist arrogance', a typical catchall charge deployed by Sharia leftists and liberals when any aspect of Islam, no matter how repulsive, is subject to critical scrutiny. Pitt's stance on matters Islamic might lead one to suppose that he was an isolated figure on the outermost margins of leftist politics. Not at all. He was politically well-connected, having worked as a researcher in the office of Ken Livingstone (who else?) during the latter's term of office as *dhimmi* Mayor of London. Also like Livingstone, Pitt also revered the thoughts and sayings of Yusef al-Qaradawi, praising this genocidal admirer of Hitler as 'a leading reformist influence amongst Muslims'. Was it mere co-incidence that Pitt echoed his employer's description of Qadarawi as the voice of 'progressive' Islam?

When Pitt and Livingstone made these statements, al-Qaradawi's 'progressive' 'modern' values were already well-known and included endorsements of female genital mutilation: 'personally I support this under the circumstances in the modern [sic] world'; suicide bomb attacks on Israeli civilians, the death penalty for homosexuals and apostates from Islam and, of course, wife beating. Were these the policies Livingstone had in mind when he said that al-Qaradawi was 'the future of Islam'? To those well versed in the history of Islam, his teachings revealed an all-too familiar yearning for a return to its seventh century desert origins.

Pressed to justify his undeniably close relationship with someone of such reactionary views, Livingstone claimed that Zionists were responsible for their false translation into English...the work of the world Jewish conspiracy perhaps? In fact, all these citations were to be found in English on this clerical Nazi's own website. When the Qaradawi scandal broke in the UK, and with the reputation of one of their own at stake, the UAF affiliate, the 'moderate' Muslim Council of Britain, came to his defence, praising this anti-Semitic, homophobic and misogynistic Hitler lover as 'the most renowned and authoritative Muslim scholar in the world today'. Quotations attributed to him had, it was true, not been mistranslated as Livingstone claimed, but 'taken out of context'...yet again. As, for example, advocating female genital mutilation for the 'modern woman'. What, one wonders, could be a 'context' that justifies statements such as this?

Given his enthusiastic endorsement of FGM, al-Qaradawi and his Sharia left defenders would have been gratified to learn from a report made public on January 26, 2015 that every day, repeat every day, 15 girls were being admitted to hospital, after undergoing this barbaric initiation into the blighted world of Islamic womanhood, though not in Somalia or Egypt, where it known to be rife, but in the UK, where, officially at least, it is not. They would be have also been relieved to learn that despite the UK's allegedly all-pervading climate of Islamophobia, since its outlawing in 1985, there had to date been no prosecutions for this crime. Another triumph for multiculturalism. But not for the shibboleth of women's rights. *Dhimmi* 'feminists', so offended by images of female breasts in a tabloid that they succeeded in banning the offending newspaper from university campuses, took female genital mutilation, female infanticide and Muslim gang rape in their stride, preferring to focus instead the far more pressing issue of the all-pervading oppression of upper middle class white women by the white patriarchy.

As a footnote to the Sharia left's relationship with al-Qaradawi, a story broke in late 2014 that in his capacity as Chairman of the 'International Union of Muslim

Scholars', he had drawn up the syllabus of study for an Islamic college based in Wales, at Llanybydder. Assuming the innocuous and 'progressive' name of the 'European Institute of Human Sciences', it managed to dupe the University of Lampeter, the oldest in Wales, into taking the 'Institute' under its wing, lending the it an entirely underserved aura of academic respectability. A police report found its 'ethos' to be 'moderate', though one naturally wonders why the police should have been investigating what was, on the surface at least, a purely academic institution. But this where the plot thickens. One young Muslim amongst those enrolled for tuition at the 'Institute', praised in his report as a 'good student', did indeed prove his worth, going on to achieve great things in the name of Islam. He was Michael Adebowale, one of the two murderers and attempted decapitators of Fusillier Lee Rigby. His partner in the *Koran*-inspired, and justified, murder was Michael Adebolajo, who attended and spoke at a Sharia left Unite Against Fascism (sic) rally in Harrow in 2009. These, and many other similar examples that could be cited, are sufficient indicators of the kind of activity that has been conducted by the anti-Zionist left, through the vehicle of the UAF and its two sister organisations, the Stop the War Coalition, and the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign. (See Appendix T) It demonstrates that the far left can exert an influence that in certain situations and policy areas is out of all proportion to its extent of popular support and size of membership. Only this can explain the catapulting of Jeremy Corbyn from near total obscurity even within the Labour Party to a national figure almost overnight. This then is the 'left' we are concerned with in all its component parts, history, aspects, connections and methods, a totalitarian left that has as its goal, as did its Bolshevik forerunners, the undermining of western liberal democracy as the main barrier to the realisation its ultimate objective, the establishment of a global, one party, totalitarian state.

The support the Sharia left gives to Jihadi movements naturally raises the question: is there anything inherently 'left wing' about Islam, and the kind of societies it has created, that could justify such an alignment? Karl Kautsky, in the decades after the death of Karl Marx, the world's leading socialist theoretician, undertook two studies of the relationship between Christianity and early radical social movements. One, *The Foundations of Christianity*, focused on the first decades of the new faith as it emerged as a radical sect within Judaism, while the other, *Communism in Central Europe at the Time of the Reformation*, as the title indicates, examined a similar trend that emerged in another period of religious and political upheaval. In the first work, Kautsky drew attention, as indeed others have before and since, to Biblical passages describing a communist system of organisation that prevailed among early (Jewish) Christians who, it is clear from numerous passages in the relevant texts, were almost all if not totally recruited from the poorest classes. Oft-cited evidence of the radical tendencies and social composition of early Christianity is the saying attributed to Jesus in the three synoptic gospels, that 'it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven'. But the passages say more than this. There is an especially clear indication that a rigidly enforced rule ensured that no special privileges were accorded, at least in the sect's earliest days, to any better-off potential recruits. We are told that 'a 'certain ruler' applied to become a disciple, and when asked by Jesus whether he abided by all the commandments, confirmed that 'all these things I have kept from my youth up.' But then Jesus replies: 'Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast and distribute unto the poor, and thou

shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me'. The narrator then continues:

And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich. And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, how hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! For it easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.' (Luke, 18, 18-25) [Unlike the much-sanitised Mathew, Luke's account of the Sermon on the Mount conveys a similar message]: Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled: Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh...But woe unto you that are rich! For ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. (6: 21, 24, 25)

But James, said to be one of the four brothers (also born of a virgin) of Jesus, is stronger again. Here we are confronted with a loathing of the rich so intense that it can only have originated amongst those who were among the poorest:

Let the brother of low degree be rejoice in that he is exalted. But the rich, in that he is made low, because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away. For the sun is no sooner risen with a burning heat, but it withereth the grass, and the flower thereof falleth, and the grace of the fashion of it perisheth; so shall the rich man fade away in his ways. (4: 9-11)

As we continue, it becomes ever clearer that for those whom we today retrospectively and therefore, strictly speaking, anachronistically, call the 'early Christians', but who at this time were a wholly Jewish communist sect, the kingdom of god will be enacted not in heaven but down here, as the rich and powerful few are laid low and the impoverished many inherit the riches of the earth created by their own toil. This could almost be the *Communist Manifesto*:

Hearken, my beloved brethren. Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him? Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seats?' (3: 5, 6) 'Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl, for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are motheaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat you flesh as it were fire. You have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire of labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud [In his *Das Kapital*, Marx called this surplus value] crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter. Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receives the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your heart; *for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh*. (5: 16, emphasis added)

Under the Roman occupation of Judea, a movement espousing such radical goals needed to protect itself from potential enemies that included not only the Jewish rich, but also the soldiers of Emperor Tiberius and the collaborationist Jewish clerical establishment. In Luke, and once again only in Luke, we see Jesus, the 'Prince of Peace', instructing his disciples to arm themselves for this purpose:

And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing. Then he said unto them, But now, he that hath

a purse, let him take, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword [some then already had swords], let him sell his garment and buy one. For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me. *And he was reckoned among the transgressors.* (Luke, 22:35-37, emphasis added)

We have here a Jewish workers' militia. But unlike Mohammed's plundering, raping and enslaving bands, it is an army which fights for social justice, and has as its leader, as the philo-Semitic Nietzsche has it, a 'holy anarchist who summoned the people at the bottom, the outcasts and "sinners", to opposition against the dominant order, using language, if the gospels were to be trusted, which would lead to Siberia today.' The Old Testament relates a similar tale of rebellion. In the course of his bloody ascent to the throne, David, so Samuel tells us, placed himself at the head of an armed band of outcasts: 'And every one that was in distress and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented, gathered themselves unto him; and he became a captain over them, and there with him about four hundred men'. (1 Samuel, 21: 2) Even as king, David, we are told, took the side of the underdog:

And the Lord sent Nathan unto David. And he came unto him and said unto him, there were two men in one city; the one rich, and the other poor. The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herds: But the poor man had nothing, save one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and nourished up: and it grew up together with him, and with his children; it did eat of his own meat and drank of his own cup, and lay in his bosom, and was unto him his daughter. And there came a traveller unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock and of his own herd, to dress for the wayfaring man that was come unto him; but took the poor man's lamb and dressed it for the man that was come unto him. And David's anger was greatly kindled against the man; and he said to Nathan, as the Lord liveth, the man that hath doth this thing shall surely die. And he shall restore the lamb four-fold, because he did this thing, and had not pity. (2 Samuel, 12: 1-6)

It matters not a jot as to whether this account has any historical substance. What does matter is that this compassion for the poor, attributed to the most illustrious of all Jewish kings, was integral to the Jewish faith, as it was to the followers of Jesus, and become ever more explicit in the numerous sects that arose in the course of its development, most notably the Essenes, who preceded and anticipated the Jesus movement by at least a century, and were the first genuinely communist community for which we have authentic historical evidence. Unlike the Romanised Christians, it uniquely for its time rejected slavery, and required that all its members lived and dined together, as far as was practicable, in conditions of complete equality:

None of them desires to have property of his own, neither a house nor a slave, nor a piece of land nor herds nor whatever else constitutes wealth. But they own everything together indiscriminately, and all of them use it in common...Nobody is slave among them, but all are free, one working for the other. They hold that owning slaves is not only unjust and impious, but godless as well, a violation of the order of nature, which produced all equal as brothers. (Philo, cited in Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*)

The so called 'Dead Sea Scrolls', discovered in caves in 1947, told of another Jewish sect, the Manichean Qumran, not only contemporaneous with the Essenes, but sharing many of their beliefs: 'For everything shall be held common', and there

should prevail 'truth and fair humility, and faithful love, and just consideration for one's fellow in the holy council.' The sect exercised a Greek-style democracy, holding assemblies, called the 'many', in which all full members had the right to both speak and vote. Its rules were strict: 'Let no man interrupt his fellow whilst he is speaking, and let no man jump his assigned position to speak.' It is not clear whether women participated in the 'many', but it is certain that they had equal rights under the law.

According to accounts in the New Testament, the communism practised by the Jewish Jesus sect was not a collectivism of production, which is the distinguishing feature of modern communism, but a surrendering and then sharing of personal property, a mode of communal living and dining preserved down the centuries by the monastic orders, and for the laity, as a symbolic re-enactment of the apostle's communal meals, in the bread (though not the wine) of holy communion and the altar as the table. Outside the mainstream churches it is preserved in full to this day by Christian sects such as the Hutterites and Amish, with the important distinction that it extends to property used for productive purposes, such as farm land, livestock and tools. The clearest description of New Testament communism is to be found in the Acts of the Apostles, 2: 42-46, and 4: 32-35:

And all that believed were together and had all things common. And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart...And the multitude of them that believed was of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed as his own; but they had all things common...Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostle's feet: and the distribution was made *unto each man according as he had need*. (my emphasis)

Karl Marx, clearly invoking the same text, has it thus: 'From each according to his ability, *unto each according to his needs*'. (*Critique of the Gotha Programme*) There are other accounts from the same Biblical sources that also make it very clear that the apostles and their followers enforced a regime of strict equality, and that membership was reserved only for those who were prepared to divest themselves of all their worldly goods, for example, as in Luke 14: 33: 'Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.'

Once Christianity, in its origins an exclusively Jewish sect of the dispossessed, became first the established, and then in double quick time, the only permitted religion of the Roman Empire and finally, with the barely tolerated exception of Judaism, of all Europe, it was set on a course of transformation into the principle 'spiritual' bulwark of the established social, political and economic order. The communism of the first disciples, as recorded in the New Testament, survived, on Papal license, only within the walls of the various monastic orders that emerged in the medieval era. But even hidden away in the cloisters, 'having all things common' (parodied by the rebel Jack Cade in Henry VI Part 3) could become an embarrassment to a worldly-wise Papacy obsessed with the acquisition of power and wealth, so much so that in 1323, Pope John XXII, in his Bull *Cum inter nonullos*, proclaimed, in defiance of the testimony of his own holy book, that 'to say Christ and the apostles had no property is a perversion of scripture'. Franciscan

monks who thought otherwise were duly burnt at the stake, but to no avail, because Europe would soon be awash with all manner of heretical movements, many of which originated in the strivings by the have nots of the feudal order for social justice and political freedom.

In the turbulent years preceding and culminating in the Reformation, these movements, some even more radical than those described in the New Testament, such as the Bogomils, Bohemian Brethren, Lollards, Utraquists, Mennonites, Taborites, Anabaptists, Hussites, Waldensians and Hutterites, sprang up across Europe, chiefly drawing their support from landless peasants, miners and town craftsmen, and led in the main by disaffected lower clergy often inspired by the example of the communism described in the New Testament. Their rise climaxed in the savagely repressed German peasant uprising of 1525. Defeated on the battlefield by the overwhelmingly superior forces of its class enemies, social revolt gave way to the religious quietism of the 'inner light' and, in the centuries to come, migration to the New World to found communities, some of them communist, and churches free from persecution. Nowhere in the *Koran*, nor in any of the many thousands of *Hadith*, is there to be found in Islam the least hint of similar radical tendencies remotely comparable to those of Judaism and early Christianity.

Following the *Hijra*, Mohammed's departure in 622 from Mecca to Medina, far from being inclined towards communism and, like the early Christians in the Roman Empire, drawing their support from slaves, the main pursuit of his followers was the raiding of caravans and the plunder, massacre and yes, the enslavement of infidel tribes, followed by the conversion of the 'booty', human and material, into the private property of the looters, with one fifth always being creamed off, Mafia-fashion, by the *Capo*, Mohammed. Following his example, his contentious successors to this day continue to fight out their Middle Eastern territorial wars in a fashion little different, if at all, from Chicago mobsters. The complete absence of any remotely egalitarian element in Islam is accurately conveyed in what was, before the arrival of political correctness, universally regarded in the west as the *Koran's* barbaric punishment for theft, a crime that was hardly likely to be committed by anyone except the poor: 'And for the man and woman who steals, cut off their hands in retribution of their offence as an exemplary punishment from Allah. And Allah is Mighty, Wise'....but not, on this cocoon, compassionate. (Chapter 5, Verse 39)

One of the five pillars of Islam is *zakat*, the obligation for those that can afford to do so to give alms to the poor. Begging and alms giving have always been a mark of societies polarised between the wealthy few and the impoverished many. Alms giving may salve the conscience of the rich, but they will remain rich, and the poor will remain poor. One verse in the *Koran* in fact endorses a practice that can only further widen the gulf between the haves and the have nots: 'And Allah has favoured some of you above others in worldly gifts. But those more favoured will not restore any part of their worldly gifts to those who their right hand possesses [i.e., slaves, servants, dependents etc] so that they may be equal sharers in them. Knowing this, will they still deny the favour of Allah?' (16:72) Hardly.

In the entire history of Islam, there has been only one recorded case of a current within the faith adopting a system of collective property ownership, and it was one that, being Islamic, unlike the Jewish Essenes, also allowed for the shared possession of slaves. In the heat of the bloody feuds that broke out after Mohammed's death in 632, there emerged the two main trends in Islam that are still

at war today, the Sunni, mainly in the centre, south and west of the Islamic world, and the Shi'a in the east. Neither was homogenous, and this too is still the case today. A radical trend within the Shi'a, drawing its support mainly from 'outsiders', Bedouins and Persians, and more generally from the poorest classes, rebelled against the aristocratic leadership of Ali, the Prophet's son-in law, forming a sect known as the Kharijites, from the word *kharaja*, to go out, or break away. Uniquely amongst Islamic schools, before they were crushed, like their Christian counterparts of the 16th century, by their co-religionists, the Kharijites developed a system of collective property similar to that of the radical movements of the early Reformation, but with the crucial difference that unlike their Christian counterparts, they did not derive their inspiration or justification from a Koranic precedent or an appropriate holy text, for none such existed.

The texts, and the history of Islam speak for themselves. Of the world's three monotheisms, Islam has proved itself to be intrinsically by far the most 'right wing', both in its doctrine and in the societies it has created and ruled over for the last thousand years and more. Beyond any dispute, they rank among the most unequal and repressive in the world, so much so that were they to be replicated in the west and governed by non-Muslims, it would be the Sharia left who would proclaim this the loudest. Yet not only the left, but the media and politicians generally, invariably label critics of and campaigners against Islam, irrespective of their general political stance and pedigree, as 'right wing', 'right wing extremist' or even 'racist'. Let us ignore this last on the irrefutable grounds that however one defines 'race', Islam, being a religion and not a people, is not one, and instead, ask the two questions, why and in what way or ways is criticising Islam necessarily 'right wing'? Is atheism 'right wing' because it sees Islam, like other religions, as a collection of primitive superstitions? Is secularism 'right wing' because it opposes the intrusion of Islam, again together with all other faiths, into the political arena, demanding exemptions and privileges, or because it supports the total separation of church and state? Are the USA and France right wing because by law they do not allow any religious practices in their state school systems, be the faith Islam or any other? (On the contrary, in both countries, opposition to this law has always come from the Right.) In what sense is it 'right wing' to criticise a movement such as Hamas not only for its anti-Semitism and brutal suppression of all political opposition, but for its denunciation of the historic Left as a Zionist conspiracy, and for the accumulation of vast fortunes by its racketeering and totally corrupt absentee leaders? By the standards that the Sharia left applies to secular political movements, Hamas would be classified as not merely right wing, but Nazi. There is an easy, if indirect way, to resolve this question and, by so doing, expose the mendacious motives of those who seek to discredit and silence critics of Islam by associating them with 'right wing' and even fascist politics. Let us suppose that a new and entirely secular party appears on the political scene. Amongst its policies, we learn that it advocates the following:

- 1: Extreme anti-Semitism, involving a belief in a world Jewish conspiracy and the need to exterminate all Jews, together with an adulation of Adolf Hitler.
- 2: The submission of women to men, and their reduction to a legally enforced status of second-class citizens.
- 3: The goal of world conquest and the establishment a worldwide dictatorship

enforced by a single party, together with the abolition of all democratic institutions and practices.

- 4: The party's founder to be regarded as infallible and above all criticism. Suppression of all opinions and beliefs within the party that differ in the slightest degree from his teachings.
- 5: The punishment by death of all who leave the party, or who diverge from its teachings in any way.
- 6: Total party control of all intellectual, academic and cultural activities.
- 7: Party regulation of all contacts, including sexual, between the sexes, and of all other family and personal relationships. Adultery and homosexuality to be outlawed and punished by death.
- 8: Party control of eating, drinking, sexual relations, personal hygiene and body functions.
- 9: Slavery, including the ownership of concubines, to be legalised.
- 10: Wife beating and rape within marriage to be legalised.
- 11: Marriage to and sexual relations with minors to be legalised.
- 12: All socialist organisations and activities to be outlawed and their leaders killed.
- 13: Workers' organisations and strikes to be made illegal.
- 14: Party control and censorship of the media.
- 15: Indoctrination of the very young in party ideology.
- 16: All education to be controlled by the party and conducted according to party ideology.
- 17: Party control of all cultural and recreational activities.
- 18: All laws and judicial procedures to be determined and regulated by the party.
- 19: The re-introduction of the death penalty for a wide range of actions hitherto treated as legal.
- 20: The killing of those who do not submit to the rule of the party.

There is not the least doubt that should such a party announce these policies to the western world, it would be instantly and unanimously described and denounced by the left as not only right wing, but, albeit in some respects idiosyncratically, as fascist, not least by Unite Against Fascism, provided its particular clerical provenance was not disclosed. Yet each one its policies is either contained within the founding texts of the Islamic faith or practised by states and movements based upon them. How is it, then, that opposing these very same policies came to be described as 'right wing extremist', even Nazi? The accusation that criticism of Islam is *ipso facto* proof of racism is no less absurd, especially bearing in mind that Islam is itself racist in its genocidal hatred of the Jews. How then can it be racist to criticise anti-Semitic passages in the *Koran*? The followers of Islam are no more a race than Christians, and, just like Christians, are to be found in every continent and in every nation. Islam is global both in its adherents and in its ambitions. As a creed, it has no skin colour or genetic code. It follows therefore that a critique of Islam, as of any religion, philosophy or political doctrine, is the critique of an idea, not a 'race', and it takes place on two levels, neither of which involves the racial abuse of its adherents. Firstly, it seeks to establish, in the light of the available evidence, the validity or otherwise of the claims Islam makes for itself in its founding texts; secondly, it examines the effects Islam has on those who subscribe to its beliefs, and also on those who do not. This is what a reasoned, evidence-based critique of

any belief system, religious or secular, would involve. When applied to, say, liberalism or socialism, who would claim that such a critique is racist because their founders and first followers, like Islam, shared the same skin colour? Why is it that only Islam is afforded this special protection from criticism? Why is it that critiques of other religions are not automatically branded as racist, even when, unlike Islam, the faiths have a strong 'ethnic' component and following, such as Sikhism, Jainism, Hinduism, Shintoism, Taoism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism and Judaism? Only Islam gets a free pass. And nowhere more so than from the renegade secularists of the Sharia left.

Islam shares another aspect that is integral to fascism, especially its racist Nazi variant. The '*Ummah*' the world-wide community of all Muslim believers, irrespective of class, has a close affinity with the Nazi '*Volkgemeinschaft*', the 'racial community' of all Germans, likewise a supposedly harmonious community irrespective of class. In each case, belonging to a faith or racial 'community' overrides, denies, negates, and seeks to stifle, minimise, hide and deny what for the pre-Sharia left was once central to their outlook: class conflict, defined socially, economically and politically, just as they both repudiate authentic liberalism's assertion of the uniqueness and autonomy of the individual. The Islamic *Ummah*, like its Nazi counterpart, compels, on pain of persecution, ostracism or even worse, all individuals within the 'community' to conform to a code of behaviour and adhere to a doctrine that permit of no deviation or dissent. The word *Islam* means just this, *submission*. In non-Islamic countries, where the self-segregation of Muslims has been imposed from within and allowed and even encouraged from without by multiculturalism, the 'Islamic community' functions as a prison within an otherwise free society. These two largely incompatible and antagonistic worlds are then, in pursuit of 'community cohesion', enjoined by various public bodies to 'celebrate' their 'diversity' on the one hand and on the other, the host society, whatever private feelings might be about the arrangement, to respect and applaud it. As those who have lived to tell the tale can testify, escape from the diaspora 'Muslim community', especially for its female inmates, can be a risky business. (See Appendix IV) Instead of exposing and challenging this incipient theocratic totalitarianism, with its concealment of class exploitation, and supervision and regimentation of the individual, over the last two decades or more the Sharia left has progressively supplanted the materialist, socio-economic categories of Marx with the quackery and Sharia-speak of multiculturalism, with its condescending idealisation of 'warm', 'close knit' and 'vibrant' 'communities' (like Rotherham perhaps) where the law of Allah rules and young *kuffar* girls are sex slaves, so tightly knit in fact that over half of its marriages are between cousins, resulting in an infant mortality rate twice the national average and far above average mental illnesses and physical deformities, consequences that I have told by one of the UK's leading neurologists, medical staff fear to discuss openly lest they be accused of racism.

Our era is now more than ever one of the politics of 'community', 'diversity' and 'identity', in which a spurious homogeneity of each national, ethnic, racial and religious group serves as the vehicle for the self-serving manipulations of a burgeoning multicultural industry, and provides the pretext for the rise of self-appointed 'community' leaders and spokesmen, such as of the Muslim Council of Britain. The Sharia left, by identifying itself with a spurious 'Muslim community', and not, as traditional socialists would, with workers who just happen to be

Muslims, has become one more player in this sordid racket of 'victimhood', privilege-checking and special pleading. The Sharia left's 'street' version of 'community' politics can be seen in the manner in which it responded to the Gaza crisis in the summer of 2014. Embracing Hamas ('We are all Hamas') as the authentic voice of the Palestinians, the permanent anti-Israel campaign shifted up several gears, to the extent that it began to imitate the methods used against the Jews in the pre-war Third Reich, when in an official boycott of the Jews in April 1933, storm troopers blocked the entrances to Jewish-owned stores, and in the infamous 'Crystal Night' pogrom of November 1938, when Nazi gangsters were licensed to burn down synagogues, vandalise and loot Jewish property and assault, arrest and murder Jews. In the summer of 2014, on the streets of continental Europe, mobs of young Muslims, leftists and Nazis were again enforcing boycotts, besieging synagogues, vandalising Jewish property and assaulting Jews. Jews have been gunned down by Muslims in France, Denmark and Belgium, and repeatedly physically assaulted in the UK, again, always by Muslims. In Germany, three Muslims followed in the footsteps of the pre-war Nazis by attempting to burn down a synagogue, but on appearing in court, were absurdly cleared by a sympathetic judge on the grounds that their action was a demonstration of solidarity with Gaza Palestinians. These events happened, not in Germany in 1933 or 1938, but 2014. (On October 4, 2019, another of Chancellor Merkel's Muslim guests also demonstrated his solidarity with the Palestinians. Armed with a long knife and shouting 'God is Great' and 'Fuck Israel', he attempted to force his way into a Berlin synagogue. Arrested by police posted to guard the building from just such an attack, he too was later released without charge. As they say, you couldn't make it up.)

In the UK, Belfast's synagogue was attacked twice, one of Brighton's three synagogues sprayed with pro-Hamas graffiti, and Jewish worshippers in Liverpool abused with chants of 'baby killers', (yes, again) while two young Muslim men awaited trial accused of racially aggravated common assault on a Gateshead rabbi. Other targets that also had also no connection with Israel but were selected simply because their owners were Jewish included Tesco and Marks and Spencer. In some cases, Nazi storm trooper-style blockades forced 'Jewish' shops to temporarily close. In another 'action', demands for the removal of products bought by Jewish customers resulted in shelves being stripped bare, with the connivance of staff. Neither had the cultural front been neglected. Again, following the Nazi example, Israeli artists had performances cancelled at the 2014 Edinburgh Festival, after promoters shamefully capitulated to threats of violence.

The bench mark for these tactics was established some years earlier, when in 2011, a performance by the Israel Philharmonic at the BBC Proms was sabotaged by organised singing and chanting of anti-Israeli slogans by supporters of Corbyn's Palestinian Solidarity Campaign, resulting in the BBC interrupting and then finally abandoning its transmission of the concert. When scuffles broke out on the floor of the auditorium between banner-carrying hecklers and audience members who had come to listen to music and not engage in Jew-baiting, security officials intervened, removing thirty disrupters. But there were no arrests. Such assaults on free cultural exchange and expression are not only intended to silence Israeli Jews, but any Jew whom anti-Zionists suspect of harbouring sympathies for Israel, a net cast so wide it necessarily includes the vast majority of Jews worldwide. One artist targeted on this basis was a US citizen, the Jewish reggae singer Matisyahu, who was scheduled

to appear in August 2015 at the Rotom Sunsplash music festival in the Spanish town of Benicassim north of Barcelona. After demands by local BDS activists that Matisyahu be banned from the event, festival organiser Fillipo Giunta presented him with an ultimatum: either sign a statement supporting the creation of an independent Palestine, or be banned from the festival, a condition which the singer quite correctly rejected. Can one seriously believe that a Russian artist would have been required to sign a similar declaration in support of an independent Chechnya or against the illegal Russian annexation of the Crimea and South Ossetia, or performers from Iran, Syria, Iraq or Turkey to endorse a free Kurdistan? Matisyahu had been banned simply because he was a Jew, proving yet again that the Sharia left's anti-Zionism is anti-Semitic.

Then we have professional sport. As one would expect, given the huge sums of money invested and generated in its promotion, and in recent decades its intense politicisation, sport has inevitably been drawn into the orbit of world Islam. Being a global sport, football has been the principal target for Muslim colonisation, a prime example being the FA Cup, which is now the Emirates Cup, and another, the buying of top-ranking clubs. But the corrosive and corrupting effects of Islam has also been felt in the more restricted area of tennis. The occasion was a tournament sponsored by Barclays Bank in the United Arab Emirates, a state regarded by many in the West as being amongst the most forward looking and liberal in the Islamic world. In the event, however, not forward looking or liberal enough, because when Shahar Pe'er, ranked 45th woman in the world, applied for a visa to play in the tournament in Dubai, her application was rejected on the grounds that being an Israeli Jew, her appearance on court 'would have antagonised our [Muslim] fans'. The TV Tennis Channel, which was due to screen the event, did the honourable thing, and cancelled its coverage. However, the response of others involved in the tournament to this act of blatant racial discrimination was anything but honourable. Though under considerable pressure to drop its sponsorship of the tournament, Barclays refused to do so, perhaps fearful that protesting against anti-Semitism in sport might have 'antagonised our Muslim investors'. That left the players and their trade union, the Women's Tennis Association.

Surely here was a situation where sisterly and player solidarity was the order of the day; a case of 'an injury to one is an injury to all'. The WTA had on previous occasions used its bargaining position to act on behalf of its member's interests, for example by securing equal pay for less than equal work (women play only best of three sets matches) so there was every reason to assume that it would do so now, because this was an open and shut case of discrimination against a player purely on the grounds of her race and nationality. But it was not to be. Not a single woman player withdrew from the event, and the WTA did not advise them to do so. So much for sisterhood. It was left to a white patriarch, former US Open Champion Andy Roddick, to stage a one-man protest by refusing to defend the title he won at same tournament the previous year. Pressed to justify their failure to stand by a player excluded on grounds of race, the black Williams sisters, both members of the Jehovah Witness sect, had their excuses ready. Venus explained that it was necessary to 'look at the bigger picture'. What picture is bigger in sport than racism, one might ask, especially for a player who if she had been playing on the world tour during the apartheid era would, like Wimbledon Champion Arthur Ashe, have been debarred from competing in South African tournaments on exactly the same racial grounds as Shahar Pe'er? Perhaps this aspect of the case had not occurred to her,

because so far as she and her sister Serena were concerned, her 'bigger picture' was the 'sponsors, fans and everyone who has invested a lot in this tournament'. These are the same 'fans' whom, according to the event's organisers, would have been 'antagonised' by the sight of a Jew on court, just as apartheid era white South African 'fans' could have been by the presence of Venus Williams. Why not be honest and say that while racism in tennis is of course a terrible thing, when its victim is a Jew, the sponsor is a bank, and the racists are Muslims, one must see the 'bigger picture'.

Venus Williams' order of priorities was not out of keeping with a long-standing tradition in the Jehovah Witnesses of a hostility to the Jews that goes deeper than the theological differences which set the church at odds with not only Judaism but all other Christian denominations. It was initiated by Joseph Franklin Rutherford, the Witnesses second (and last) President from 1917 to his death in 1942. In Rutherford's many writings, speeches and statements defining Witnesses doctrine, there occur numerous passages that can only be defined as anti-Semitic in the purely secular sense of the term, that is, they are racist, having no overt basis in theology. What is equally to the point, neither have they been subsequently repudiated as heretical. Shortly after his election as President, Rutherford could be heard telling delegates to a Witnesses convention in Winnipeg, Manitoba that a Jew was 'the hooked-nosed, stooped-shouldered little individual who stands on the street corner trying to gyp you out of every nickel you've got'. In his book, *A Righteous Government: The Golden Age*, published in 1927, Rutherford elevated street-hustling Jews to a race of 'profiteering conscienceless selfish men who call themselves [sic?] Jews, and who control the greater portion of the finances of the world and the businesses of the world'. Here we have, yet again, fully developed, the myth of the ubiquitous 'World Jewish Conspiracy', first expounded in *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* at the beginning of the 20th century by Russian Orthodox clerics., one that Corbyn infamously failed to detect in his reading of John Hobson's *Imperialism* - see Appendix T. So it was only to be expected that when the Nazis came to power in 1933, in order to ward off measures against the sect, Rutherford should attempt to find common ground with this theory's most fanatical believers. The opportunity (and necessity) of declaring the Witnesses' agreement with the racial goals of the new regime arose after a police raid on the sect's premises in Magdeburg. A Witnesses rally held at Berlin on June 25, 1933, in a stadium festooned with swastika flags, endorsed the text of a letter addressed to Hitler that not only avowed loyalty to his regime but approved its measures against the Jews. Echoing the Nazis' 'socialism of fools' demagoguery, the letter attacked 'the commercial Jews of the British-American empire who have built up and carried on big business as a means of enslaving and oppressing the people of many nations'.

Then came the declaration of loyalty:

Instead of being against the principles advocated by the government of Germany, we stand squarely for such principles. A careful examination of our books and literature will disclose the fact that the very high ideals held and promulgated by the present national government are set forth, endorsed and strongly emphasised in our publications.

And, as far as the 'Jewish question' was concerned, this was true. So it is not unreasonable to suggest that perhaps the Williams sisters' 'bigger picture' could have had as much to do with the commands of Jehovah (ironically, derived from the Hebrew name for God, *Yahweh*) as concerns about the needs of fans and sponsors. Whatever their motivations, their failure to stand by their fellow player was an outrage.

Just as in tennis, those who administer the affairs of football assure us that there is no room in the sport for racism, whether on or off the pitch. And action, including spectator prosecutions, suspensions and financial penalties has, quite rightly, been taken when the racism has been directed against black players. Yet when a football manager vented his prejudice against Jews, and his club owner, a wealthy donor to Tory party funds, rallied to his defence, after a long delay, the comments were deemed by the Football Association to be anti-Semitic, but not considered to constitute proof of racism. (Livingstone shares the same opinion) Yet mere criticism of Islam (not abuse of Muslims) can be, even though as I and many others have said, Islam is not a race. Strange indeed are the workings of a game increasingly owned by Islamic interests and finance. When a club played one owned by Jews, its fans mimicked the sound of hissing gas, Yet the manager of the targeted team claimed he heard nothing, though everyone else did. No action was taken. On the pitch and online, Muslim footballers gave the revamped Nazi salute, the '*quenelle*', and yet accusations of anti-Semitism were rejected by the sport's governing bodies. In clear violation of FA rules, after scoring a goal, a Muslim footballer pulled off his shirt, contrary to rule, to reveal to spectators and TV viewers the logo 'God is Great', also contrary to rule. Again, nothing happened. In all, not exactly what one would call a level playing field. Muslim ownership of a team can even impact on freedom of speech. When a club's new Saudi owners carried out 81 executions in one day, asked for his opinion, its manager felt unable to comment.

Neither was the playing field exactly level when in September 2015, Wales and Israel were due to meet in a European Cup match in Cardiff. As was their right, anti-Zionist protestors mobilised by the Stop the War Coalition gathered in Cardiff to demand the exclusion of the Israeli team from the competition, supplementing the Palestinian Authority's campaign to have Israel expelled from FIFA. (Even though, contrary to FIFA rules, Muslim national teams have always refused to play against Israel in the World Cup, no action has been taken against them by FIFA, a body which, like the UN, defers to its Islamic block vote.) Also timed to coincide with the match, an exhibition sponsored by the UK Israeli Embassy opened in Cardiff Central Library titled 'No to Violence, Yes to Sport', which depicted ethnically integrated football in apartheid Israel's minor leagues. So far, so good. For once, the right to free expression on both sides of the divide seemed to be honoured as it should. But not for long. The next day, while the anti-Israel demonstrations proceeded as planned, the Israeli exhibition did not. It had been closed. A council official explained why: 'Following a complaint, it was decided to review the material and the exhibit was withdrawn. The Council is aware that there are protests planned around the Wales-Israel game at the week-end, and this was taken into consideration.' This is a truly extraordinary statement. Would it not have been more honest to say, 'we closed the exhibit because we had reasonable grounds to assume that if we did not, there would be a risk of mob violence.'? Were we really expected to believe that those responsible for checking and approving the contents of the exhibition missed something first time around? I suspect that the

motive for this cowardly act of Sharia censorship by an elected public authority lay not in any belated discovery of 'material', the objectionable nature of which was left unspecified, but in the (undisclosed) identity of those who made the complaint and the reference, almost as an afterthought, to the presence in Cardiff of anti-Israeli protestors.

Cardiff Labour Council's cancellation of the exhibition was greeted gleefully by those who, one suspects, had demanded it. A spokesman for the Stop the War Coalition 'welcome[d] Cardiff Council's decision to cancel an exhibition sponsored by the Israeli embassy that whitewashes the reality of football in the Middle East.' (Actually, Israel, where it is racially and religiously integrated.) But why had the Cardiff powers that be collaborated in this exercise in Sharia left censorship? As for 'whitewash', it so happened that half of Apartheid Israel's squad, including its captain, were Palestinians. Imagine, if you can, a Jew playing for, let alone captaining, an Arab or Muslim national team.

The Cardiff cancelling was not an isolated operation. Over the past two decades and more, the Sharia left and its Muslim allies have been engaged in a campaign to silence, by any means, including the law and the threat of and actual violence, opinions about Israel and Islam different from their own, and spread lies about Israel and deny public spaces to those who defend its right to exist. While it is true that the far left has always been prepared, in theory at least, to use violent methods in pursuit of its goals, demanding censorship, and having recourse to the law and administrative measures by public authorities to enforce it, is something relatively new, and represents yet one more concession the Sharia left has made to appease its Muslim allies, for whom calling in the police to silence those who show insufficient respect to their faith and its prophet is standard procedure. There was a time when those on the left would have scorned what they would have termed 'reliance on the capitalist state', such as was the case in Cardiff, to silence selected political opponents. Back in the 1970s, the SWP front, the Anti-Nazi League, rather than call on public authorities to do their job for them, instead used their own threat of or even actual violence, so-called 'direct action', to deny free speech to those judged unfit to exercise it. Initially, the slogan of those times was 'no free speech for fascists', the prime target being the neo-Nazi National Front. Then the speech to be targeted was extended to the banning of Jewish Societies by University Student Unions (eventually more than thirty) on the grounds that they too were racist, a harbinger of the current Muslim and Sharia leftist practice of likening Zionist Jews to Nazis. But whoever was the target, reliance on 'direct action' remained the norm, while student union bans could be justified on the grounds that they were not imposed by state institutions.

Today, all such inhibitions have been cast aside. The offensive from below against free expression, although still using the same intimidatory tactics, has been supplemented by endorsing and even soliciting censorship from above, as we have seen in numerous cases on campuses both in the UK and the USA, and by public authorities, such as Cardiff Council in the matter of its closure of the Israeli football exhibition. Drawn together by their shared hatred of Israel and contempt for individual freedom, the Leninoid Sharia left and organised Islam, with its demands for 'respect' and 'responsible' free speech, have combined to demand, and as in this last case, secure ever tighter restrictions on public displays of sympathy for the Zionist cause no less than criticism of Islam. We have already cited what Trotsky had to say on the subject of press freedom. His comments on the related question

of political freedom are no less pertinent and illustrate once again how far his onetime followers have strayed from his principles. He deliberately chose the most extreme cases possible of two movements that themselves sought and, once in power, enforced the elimination of all political freedoms: '[Despite] being an irreconcilable opponent not only of fascism but also of the present day [Stalinist] Comintern, I am at the same time decidedly against the suppression of either of them'. Trotsky advocated free speech even for fascists and Stalinists. So why could not his followers permit it for Zionists, who are neither?

Over the last two decades, the Islamisation of football has gathered pace, with Sheikh Mansour bin Zayed Al Nabiyani of Abu Dhabi buying Manchester City and its Etihad stadium, and the Uzbek Muslim Alisher Usmanov taking a 29.11% share in Arsenal and its 'Emirates' stadium, while the Saudi take-over of Newcastle United in October 2021 made it wealthier than all the remaining 19 Premiership clubs combined. Abroad, there was Qatar's Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani's ownership of Paris Saint-Germain, while in September 2014, Real Madrid signed a promotional agreement with the National Bank of Abu Dhabi which included amongst its clauses the removal of the Christian cross from the club's logo. Muslim money is not just buying clubs. Qatar, which finances Hamas terrorism and plays host to its absentee billionaire leaders, has not only bought Barcelona and Paris St. Germain FCs, but votes in the rigged contest to host the World Cup in 2022, which led to the arrest in 2019 of former FIFA President Michel Platini. FIFA, increasingly dominated by third world and Islamic regimes as corrupt as itself, has repeatedly dismissed proven charges of bribery as 'racist'.

If this trend continues, as I believe it will, football fans can look forward to a time in the not-too-distant future when the ancient religious feuds of Islam are fought out in the stadia of Europe's elite football clubs with no less fervor than at 'old firm' clashes between Protestant Glasgow Rangers and Catholic Glasgow Celtic. When FIFA President Sepp Blatter was finally forced to step down in 2015 after being re-elected yet again by his partners in crime, a Muslim candidate immediately emerged as a front runner, namely Prince Ali bin al-Hussein of the Kingdom of Jordan. It is no exaggeration to say that his was a name not widely known among football fans in the west, but that counted for little in a sport where bribery and Islamic leverage matter most. Prince Hussein claimed that he was the best candidate for a 'new beginning and new ideas', yet he clearly had no intention of questioning or investigating the criminal activities that led to the success of the Russian and Qatar bids: 'I think it would be lovely [sic] to have a world Cup in Russia and also Qatar.' What was most definitely not 'lovely' were the working and living conditions, and absence of the labour rights of the workers, mostly non-Muslims, imported into Qatar to construct the stadia for the World Cup in 2022. With workers in the richest per capita country in the world being paid as little as 80p an hour for a 60-hour week, as of May 2016, quite apart from injuries, the number of deaths had reached the staggering number, by western imperialist standards of industrial safety, of 1,200, and finally reached at least 6,500 by the time of their completion.

Cricket is not immune from the same 'Islamic effect'. On December 1, 2022, Essex County Cricket Club announced that its Chairman, Azeem Akhtar, after only three days in office, had stood down after a number of his anti-Semitic social media postings came to light. One had 'liked' said 'the pro-Israel and Zionist lobby have deep pockets and oversized control of the media', and another that 'comparing Israel with Nazis is not anti-Semitic.' (So also said Corbyn - see

Appendix U) Even in the cerebral world of chess, the long arm of Sharia law has extended into the summits of its governing body. When the *Federation Internationale des Echecs* selected Iran as the venue for the 2017 world women's chess championship, objections were raised by potential contestants when they learned that they would have to comply with the theocracy's dress code, which requires that all women must wear the hijab in public. Obviously and commendably out of step with the latest trends in western feminism, Islamophobic women chess players made it clear that they would be boycotting the event if they had to compete wearing hijabs. Instead of supporting their members, FIDE's Women's Commission called on them to drop their proposed boycott and respect 'cultural differences'. Would FIDE have used the same argument to justify defying the sporting boycott of South Africa during the apartheid era by agreeing to a whites-only world chess championship in that country? As British grandmaster Nigel Short correctly pointed out, Iran was 'flouting FIDE statutes against sex and religious discrimination'...with the agreement of the world's governing chess body. Once again, when it was a matter of women's rights, Islam trumped all, as it does everything else. So *dhimmi* feminists, instead of supporting their chess playing sisters, continued to wage their mock battle against the western white patriarchy, which allows them to wear what they like and not wear what they don't like. In August 2023, an Iranian weightlifter was banned from the sport for life for life after shaking the hand of an Israeli competitor at the World Master Weightlifting championships in Poland. No action was taken against Iran by the world body that governs weightlifting. His handshake was described as 'unacceptable and unforgivable'. In 2019, Iran's Saeid Mollaei was instructed to withdraw from the world Judo championships of that year to avoid a contest with an Israeli wrestler. After the event, he sought and was granted political asylum in Germany. In an all too rare show of opposition to the Islamisation sport, two years later, Iran was suspended from the International Judo Association

Despite the rapid and accelerating decline of religious belief and observance in the UK, reflected in a 2015 global survey in which, though facing strong competition, Britain emerged as the fourth least religious country in the world, recent years have seen a proliferation of 'prayer rooms' in public facilities and institutions, notably universities and airports. Though officially designated as 'multi-faith', these facilities have in some cases been colonised by Muslims confronted, unlike those of other faiths, with the need to fulfil at certain fixed times their demanding daily quota of prayers to the almighty. It could even be that prayer rooms are to become a standard feature at what have always been bastions of British secularism (save for Rangers-Celtic encounters), a trend highlighted by Liverpool supporter Stephen Dodds when he posted on line a photo of two Muslims praying at half time at a Liverpool cup tie, with the caption, 'Muslims praying at half-time DISGRACE'. Even though on this occasion the police decided no law had been broken and the two Muslims in question were prepared to have the matter dropped, the club responded by banning Dodds from the ground. Sensing its opportunity to indulge in yet another bout of grievance-mongering, organised Islam pounced. Fiyaz Mughal, who ran the 'Islamophobia' hotline 'Tell MAMA', argued that since 'people [sic] want to peacefully pray', clubs should 'consider making a prayer room available for those fans who want to do so'. In the full knowledge that what he was proposing was in effect a Muslim prayer room, Mughal disingenuously added that the facility could be 'listed [sic] as a multi-faith prayer room so that other faiths,

who want to use it, can do so.' Two clubs situated in areas of dense Muslim settlement, Blackburn Rovers and Bolton Wanderers, had already installed 'multi-faith' prayer rooms that were used, as could have been easily predicted, and as was intended, only by Muslims.

Tell MAMA had its government funding withdrawn when it was discovered that only 8% of 192 so-called 'Islamophobic incidents' reported on its website involved actual physical acts or threats of any kind, none of which required medical attention. The remainder were mainly online, with many originating from outside the UK. The MAMA fraud was but a part of a far larger operation by Muslim activists and their infidel dupes to present followers of Islam always as victims, and never as aggressors. In some cases, this has led to criminal acts. Across the Muslim diaspora, numerous claims of attacks on or intimidation of Muslims, after having received massive media coverage and public condemnation, were, on police investigation, proved to be false, with in some cases those responsible for their fabrication being given substantial prison sentences. These all too frequent sequels however were awarded far less publicity than the original fictitious crime, as are the far more numerous and genuine attacks on Jews, and even less so, the religion of their perpetrators.

Kuffar football fans have always gone to matches only to watch football. Those dwindling few among them who might want to pray have always done so either at home or in buildings designed specifically for that purpose, just as football stadiums have been for playing and watching football. Once again, Islam, trading on political correctness, inserted religion into places where it had never been before, was not wanted by anybody else, and if allowed (and encouraged) to continue, will lead not to integration but yet more friction and yet more segregation. But as in matters more strictly theological, Islam does not speak with one voice where football is concerned. Ultra-purist Kuwaiti cleric Sheikh Abdel Muhsin al-Mutairi warned that the Jews had been 'successful in preoccupying the Muslim youth with the inanest matters', including football. The Sheikh found the proof that football was a Jewish plot in the ever popular *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, quoting the passage where it says, 'in order to keep the masses in the dark, oblivious to what is being planned for them, we [that is, the Jews] will exert efforts to distract their intention, by creating means of entertainment and diversion, amusing games, and all kinds of sports'. Jewish plot or not, *Protocols*-quoting Sheikh Abdel Muhsin al-Mutairi will find that trying to ban football is one Jihad that Allah is destined to lose.

17 Integration?

When accused of aligning themselves with Muslim and far right anti-Semites, western leftists such as Corbyn invariably retort, as we have seen, that their enmity towards Israel is simply the reverse side of their support for the Palestinian cause, and not directed against the Jews as such, and it is on that basis alone that any such collaboration is conducted and should be judged. Are they really so naive? They must surely know that that is not how matters stand in the Middle East, as two of its clerics made very clear. The Jews are 'our enemies', one explained, 'not because they occupied Palestine', not because of where they are, but because of who they are, because 'they are infidels'. Another cleric from Qatar stated on an Arab TV network that 'we will treat the Jews as our enemies even if they return Palestine to us', further proof, if any were needed, that the existence of Israel, whatever its boundaries, is not the cause but the pretext, for Islam's war against the Jews. And the *Koran* records when this war began, not in 1948 with the birth of Israel, but in the life time of the prophet, at the so-called 'Battle of the Ditch' of March 31, 627 or, by the Islamic calendar, the year four dating from the *Hijra*, the exile from Mecca, as narrated by Mohammed's first biographer Ibn Ishaq, (See Appendix L) He relates that following the defeat of the Jewish Banu Quarayza tribe, their men were all beheaded by Mohammed personally, and the women and children enslaved and then given to Bedouin tribesmen in exchange for camels and weapons. Numerous passages in Islamic texts confirm that Muslim (and with it, therefore, its religious minorities aside, Arab) hatred for the Jews does not date from either the emergence of Zionism in the late 19th century, or the creation of Israel in 1948. It is inscribed in the sacred founding texts of the faith itself, namely the *Koran*, and the *Hadith*, which the faithful claim record the sayings and deeds of its founder.

As for any genuine concern for the Palestinians, there has always been a strand in Arab nationalism that has denied the very existence of a Palestinian nation, let alone its right to an independent state. For example, Syrian Ba'athism has always regarded Palestine as 'South Syria'. While prepared to use the Palestinian issue as a stick with which to beat Israel, it rejects the very existence of a Palestinian people distinct from the Arab people as a whole. When, in June 1976, President Assad of Syria famously read the riot act to Yasser Arafat for unleashing a civil war in Lebanon that reduced Beirut to a ruin, he told him 'You do not represent Palestine any more than we do. There is neither a Palestinian people, nor a Palestinian entity, there is only Syria, and you are an inseparable part of the Syrian people and Palestine is an inseparable part of Syria.' This denial of the existence of a Palestinian people was not confined to non-Palestinian Arab movements and regimes. So we had the absurdity of Ahmed Shukairy being appointed as the first Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organisation in 1964, despite having declared to the United Nations Security Council on May 31, 1956, that it was 'common knowledge that Palestine is nothing but southern Syria'. 'Common knowledge'? To the Palestinians? If not, surely common decency would have required that that their newly appointed leader should have informed them that they did not exist. And what price BDS and the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign? A similar view, reflecting the official Syrian Ba'athist position, was advanced by delegates from the Damascus-sponsored 'Vanguards of the Popular Liberation War'

at a P(sic)LO symposium in 1970, as reported in the journal *al-Anwar*: 'No state of Palestine should be brought into existence, because it would constitute yet another division within the Arab world.' Although the motivation differed, this position was also that of P(sic)LO leader, Zahir Muhsein, who let it slip, perhaps in an unguarded moment, to the Dutch journal *Trouw* in March 1977:

The Palestinian people do not exist. [sic!] The creation of a Palestinian state is only a means for continuing our struggle against the state of Israel. In reality there is no difference between Jordanians, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese. Only for tactical reasons do we speak today about a Palestinian people, since Arab national interests demand that we posit the existence of a distinct "Palestinian people" [his quotes] to oppose Zionism.

This, from a leader of the *Palestine* Liberation Organisation, 'the Palestinian people *does not exist*'. And in the name of a people that 'does not exist', the PLO aimed to destroy the state of a people that despite Hitler's efforts, most certainly did. *Bona fide* Arab academics long ago came to the very same conclusion as Zahir Muhsein. When Professor Philip Hitti, the Lebanese historian of the Arab peoples, was called upon as an expert to advise the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry into the Palestinian issue in 1946, he told them that in his judgment, 'there is no such thing as Palestine in history, absolutely not'. Insofar as his statement was intended to refer to an independent Palestinian state, this was a simply a statement of historical fact. In BC 63 the Romans imposed their rule over the Jewish kingdom of ancient Israel, the last independent state in what Arabs today call Palestine before the birth of modern Israel in 1948. After centuries of rule by the Byzantine Eastern Roman Empire, there followed the conquest of Jerusalem by the Religion of Peace in AD 638. Then came the Crusades, and the establishment of a Norman dynasty. After a succession of Caliphates challenged and eventually saw off the Crusaders, the last, the Mamluk, was overthrown in 1516 by the no less pacific Muslim Ottoman Turks who, like all their predecessors, never acknowledged the existence of a Palestinian people. With Turkey's defeat in 1918, there arrived finally the British and the French, who had in 1916, under the terms of the secret so-called Sykes-Picou Agreement, provided for the division of the Turkish territories in the Middle East into two zones of influence, British and French. Lawrence of Arabia, acting on the orders of his military and political superiors, had encouraged his Arab collaborators to believe, as it proved falsely, that in return for their support for the Allied cause, they would have been allowed to establish an independent Arab state on the territories occupied by the Turks in what is now Lebanon, Israel, Syria, Iraq and Jordan. Once again, none of the Arab leaders involved in the subsequent abortive negotiations with the British and the French at Versailles raised the question of a Palestinian state in what was destined to become the British Mandate.

As we have seen, the Palestine question was subsequently only forced onto the agenda by the campaigning of the British-appointed Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and future Nazi collaborator, Haj Amin Al-Husseini. When in February 1919 the first Congress of Christian and Muslim Arabs convened to discuss what proposals to put to the post-war peace conference in Paris, it adopted a resolution which insisted that 'Palestine [is] part of Arab Syria, as it has never been separated from it at any time.' There were Arab anti-Zionist leaders at that time who even opposed the use of the term Palestine to describe the British Mandate. Giving evidence in 1937 to the Peel

Commission's investigation into the problems of the Mandate, Auni Bey Abdul Hadi insisted 'there is no such country as Palestine. Palestine is a term the Zionists [sic!] invented'. In fact, he was mistaken. Palestine was the name given to the territory by the Romans and is believed to be derived from the Biblical Philistines, and, moreover, its population was Jewish, not Arab.

As one of its reasons for rejecting the UN plan to partition the British Mandate into Jewish and Palestinian states, the Arab Office insisted that 'geographically Palestine is part of Syria' and that 'its indigenous inhabitants belong to the Syrian branch of the Arab family of nations'. So, at no time in these two thousand years up until and even beyond the creation of the state of Israel in 1948 was there any recognition or assertion by Arab leaders of the existence of a Palestinian people or their right to a state of their own, and this as we have seen included the territory's various Arab Muslim rulers. And as we have already recorded, following their failure to strangle at birth the newly independent state of Israel, the armies of Jordan and Egypt, caring nothing for the fate of their (non-existent) Palestinian Arab brothers, occupied respectively the territories now known as the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, which in accordance with a resolution adopted by the United Nations in 1947 and voted against by all eight of its Arab states, were intended to comprise an independent Palestinian state.

In defiance of that resolution, the two territories now remained under the rule of Egypt and Jordan until their defeat by Israel in the Six Day War of June 1967. This history of course is a closed book, not only to the Palestinian people, but those in the west who fondly believe that the Zionists robbed the Palestinians of an independence which in reality, thanks to their Arab and Muslim occupiers, they never had. Let us be clear: the remarkably candid comments cited above denying the existence of a Palestinian nation distinct from other Arabic speaking peoples were not aberrations, or in any sense at odds with PLO strategy. In his official biography, PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat is recorded as saying: 'The Palestinian people have no national identity. I, Yasser Arafat, man of destiny [sic], will give them that identity through conflict with Israel'. *No national identity?* But Article Four of the PLO Charter, adopted in 1964, said the exact opposite: 'The Palestinian identity is a genuine, essential and inherent characteristic'. Not only this, the 'Palestinian identity' was so strong and all-pervading, it was even able to transform Jews into Arabs. Article Six read thus: 'The Jews who had normally resided in Palestine until the beginning of the Zionist invasion will be considered Palestinians'. Was this perhaps what Arafat had in mind when he spoke of 'liberat[ing] of the Jews from Zionism'? You think you are a Jew? No, you are a Palestinian, because the PLO says you are. (Before invading them, Putin likewise told Ukrainians they were Russians.) Arab Palestinians did not exist! Is it not high time the PLO's western supporters became better acquainted with this aspect of the movement's history and policies? If we were to take these leaders at their word, then despite its name and Charter, the PLO's *raison d'être* is not the 'liberation' of a people it believes to be non-existent, but rather the destruction of Israel simply because it is Jewish. ISIS went one step further, transcending not only Palestinian but even Arab nationalism in its claim to have restored the Ottoman Caliphate abolished by the Turkish parliament on March 3, 1924. So the Middle East conflict is not, as the Sharia left would have it believed, one of oppressed and dispossessed Palestinians against Israeli oppressors, but rather one of a genocidal war of Islam against Jews, as was the case in the Gaza conflict of 2014, in which the role allotted to the

Palestinians, including their children, was to serve as Hamas cannon fodder, tunnel diggers, suicide bombers and (illegal) human shields in their holy war against the offspring of apes and swine.

We have seen that western anti-Zionists have never found Arab religious fanaticism, or what is euphemistically called 'militant Islamism', an obstacle to lending unconditional and generally uncritical support to movements founded on Koranic texts. In fact, they have been contrasted favourably with the once semi-secular PLO which, unlike Hamas (!), is said to be riddled with corruption. (I say 'once', because in July 2014, on the eve of the Israel-Hamas conflict, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas declared the Palestinian cause to be 'a war for Allah'.) This stance naturally enough led to the SWP's advocating a vote for the theocratic Muslim Brotherhood in the elections that followed the so-called Egyptian 'Arab Spring' of 2011, rather than for its left and quasi-secularist opponents. It could hardly advise otherwise, given that SWP co-ordinates its anti-Zionist activities with the Muslim Council of Britain, the UK branch of the Muslim Brotherhood. The theocratic and intensely, even by Muslim standards, anti-Semitic Brotherhood was, of course, in total solidarity with its terrorist and genocidal clone, Hamas, across the border in the Gaza Strip. Yet while recourse to holy texts to vindicate political and territorial claims is perfectly in order if they are Islamic, that is not how things stand with Israel, which is condemned, along with all its other sins, for founding its claim to existence on another sacred text, the Old Testament, or *Torah*. So with the anti-Zionist left, it is a case of Islam, good, Judaism (from which much of the former is derived) bad.

But, putting aside these ever-present and so laughably blatant double standards, even this accusation is false. The modern Zionist movement was founded by the Jewish atheist, Theodor Herzl, in response to the wave of clerically-inspired anti-Semitism unleashed in France by the Dreyfus Affair at the close of the nineteenth century. (Convicted of treason by a Court Martial in 1894, and again on appeal in 1899, Dreyfus was then pardoned by President Emile Loubet in the same year, though not declared innocent. Although still officially a traitor and spy, Dreyfus was nevertheless in 1906 re-instated with the rank of major and awarded the *Legion Honneur*. Only in 1998, more than a century after his first conviction, did the French army declare Dreyfus innocent of all charges. Again, better late than never.) Precisely because of not only its secular origins but its objective, the establishment of a nation state for a people, not a religion, Zionism was (and still is) condemned as heretical by leading ultra-orthodox Jewish clerics. As a result of this ruling, from its very outset, the modern Zionist movement met with wide, determined and enduring opposition from within the Jewish religious establishment. The conservative clergy wanted nothing to do with a movement increasingly dominated by non-observant, socialist 'Labour Zionists' whose aim was the creation of a secular state based upon co-operative labour, as exemplified by the *Kibbutzim*. Such was their resistance that the atheist socialist David Ben Gurion, the first Prime Minister of Israel, called for a war against 'the rabbis who are betraying the people'.

Rabbinical opposition to Zionism did not cease with the creation of Israel in 1948. Every people has had its quislings, aspiring or actual, and the Jews have been no exception. Some schools of Orthodox Judaism have taken their hostility towards the Jewish state to extremes that hardly seem credible, joining the chorus of hate that we are more used to hearing from the Gentile anti-Zionist industry. One such, the US-based Neturei Karta, prayed for Arafat as he lay on his death bed, and sent

a delegation to his funeral. Then in December 2006, Neturei Kata Rabbis attended a Holocaust denial conference hosted by the then Iranian President, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who had pledged to 'wipe Israel off the map'. Next stop was Gaza, to declare Neturei Karta's anti-Zionist solidarity with Hamas, the movement that is pledged not only to eliminate Israel, but all Jews...including those of Neturei Karta. By contrast with these clerical buffoons, the pioneers, founders and defenders of the state of Israel were overwhelmingly men and women of the secular, including Marxist, left. In one of history's many ironies, what masquerades today as the Marxist left campaigns for secular Israel's destruction at the hands of the Islamic clerical right.

An illusion found not only on the left but in the sphere of high politics is that the Palestinian Liberation Organisation and its dominant faction, Fatah are, like the founders of Israel, essentially secular in their ideological inspiration and orientation and act therefore as a moderating force in Palestinian and Middle Eastern affairs. The truth is that the PLO and Fatah have over the years presented several different faces to the world. In its early stages, when the Soviet bloc was one of two dominant world powers, and a major source of military hardware and expertise for Arab regimes in the Middle East, the PLO followed the example set by some of its semi-secular Arab patrons, chiefly Egypt, Algeria, Libya and Ba'athist Syria and Iraq, in adopting of necessity a leftist and even secular stance. There was talk, but little else, of 'Arab' and yes, even 'Islamic' socialism, though those days, together with the Soviet bloc, are now long gone, with Fatah's theocratic rival Hamas deploring socialism as a Jewish invention, a *Protocols*-inspired fantasy that did not deter Comrade Corbyn from calling the movement his 'friends'. Yet this dependency on the Soviet bloc was never total. At the same time, as an insurance and counterweight to too great a reliance on Moscow, the PLO maintained its links, albeit sometimes strained, with the Arab League and its ultra-conservative Arab monarchies of Saudi Arabia, the Gulf States, and Jordan.

The breakup of the Soviet bloc, culminating in the fragmentation of the USSR itself in 1991, called for a new strategy by the PLO. The so-called 'new world order' that emerged after the demise of the Soviet Union required that the PLO, while still maintaining its Arab connections, now turned to the west. The socialist rhetoric (but very little else), and talk of 'armed struggle' against and the total elimination of the 'Zionist entity' fitfully yielded, in words at least, to a recognition of Israel, a 'peace process' and a projected 'two state solution', a deal which, as far as Israel was concerned, had been on the table from the conclusion of the Arab-Israeli war of 1967. Following the Oslo Accords of 1993, for the next decade or so, the PLO and its affiliates, principally the dominant faction, Arafat's Fatah, turned a face to the west and indeed did its best to appear 'moderate' and secular, paying occasional lip service, though nothing more, to agreements that it had made with Israel to work towards a two-state solution. But over time, there emerged another face, turned towards Islam and a rising wave of religious-inspired terrorism. Theologically grounded movements such as Hamas (an acronym for 'Islamic Armed Movement'), founded in 1987, Hezbollah ('The party of God') in 1982, and Islamic Jihad (sic) in 1981, now came to the fore on the basis of their rejection of the Oslo Accords, which they each aimed to undermine by a war of terror against Israel. So far as domestic politics were concerned, the rise of Jihadist Islam in the Middle East generally, and of Hamas in Gaza, therefore obliged the hitherto semi-secular Fatah wing of the Palestinian Authority and the PLO to make certain adjustments.

Discarding the traditional Arab and Palestinian secular, nationalist rhetoric of the Arafat era, a Fatah TV broadcast in 2012 instead found inspiration in the anti-Semitism of the *Koran*: 'Our war with the descendants of the apes and pigs [as in the *Koran*] is a war of religion and faith. Long live Fatah!'

It is this face that revealed itself in a series of terrorist attacks on Jewish civilians in Jerusalem beginning in the autumn of 2014 and which were still continuing nine years on. All told, the number of Jewish civilians murdered in the so-called 'Knife Intifada' of 2014-16 reached 61, with nearly 900 wounded, though one would have not learned this from most western media sources. The prelude to this senseless slaughter was a series of, even by Fatah standards, venomous racist diatribes against the Jews in PA media, typified by a Koranically-inspired poem transmitted by PA TV on September 12, 2014:

O you who were brought up spilling blood
O you who murdered Allah's pious prophets
You have been rendered to humiliation and hardship
O sons of Zion, O most evil among nations
O barbarous apes, O wretched pigs
I will not fear your thongs
My belt is around my waist, and my rifle is on my shoulder.

With West Bank Palestinians bombarded around the clock with incitements to murder Jewish 'apes' and 'pigs', on October 22 and again on November 5, cars were driven at Jewish pedestrians walking in the city, resulting in four deaths. Two days later, Palestinian Authority TV featured a statement on the murders committed by Fatah official Muhammad al-Biq'a'l, one which could have been culled from the ravings of Julius Streicher, the most depraved of all Nazi anti-Semites: Jerusalem 'needs blood to purify itself of Jews' The initial demand for more Jewish blood was made on November 7, 2014. On November 18, the call was answered when four Rabbis were hacked to death by knives and meat cleavers in a Jerusalem synagogue. Following this series of terrorist murders, the two synagogue assassins, who were then killed in a shoot-out by Israeli police, were hailed as 'martyrs' by PA media, and victims of Zionist brutality by Muslim Tory peer, Baroness Sayeed Warsi. Then, on November 22, Sultan Abu Al-Einan, political adviser to PA President and PLO Chairman Mahmoud Abbas, issued a statement endorsing the murders: 'Blessed be your quality weapons, the wheels of your cars, you axe and kitchen knives. By Allah, these are stronger than the arsenal of our enemy because they are used according to Allah's will. We are the soldiers of Allah's will.' Bear in mind that it was with Abbas and Sultan Abu Al-Einan that Israel had to negotiate the 'two state solution'. Corbyn's Hamas 'friends', naturally, praised the killings (executed, it seems, by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine) describing them as a 'quality [sic] development, an appropriate and functional response to the crimes of the occupation'. Unlike, of course, Israel's 'disproportionate' response to Hamas terrorism. In the UK, Ahmed Brahim, of the *registered* charity 'Project for Peace [sic!] and Development', saluted one of the car killers as 'this lion, this son of Islam' who had carried through his 'operation to kill pigs'. In the Islamic scheme of things, killing 'pigs', that is, Jews, was an act of charity that contributed to 'peace and development'.

Following the example of their religious brethren in Jerusalem, Muslims staged a series of 'copycat' attacks in a number of French cities, driving vehicles into crowds of pedestrians, to the cry, 'God is great'. They were inspired not only by the Jerusalem killings, but by a video produced by French Jihadis fighting for ISIS in Syria. It called on French Muslims to 'kill them [the infidels] and spit in their faces and run over them with your cars,' a call that was duly answered. Back in Jerusalem, ten months on, the killings resumed, incited, and then praised, as before, by leading organs and officials of the Palestinian Authority. When Palestinian youths hurled rocks at Jews commemorating the Jewish New year at the Temple Mount, killing one and wounding several more, PA President Mahmoud Abbas again saw fit to praise the attackers: 'Each drop of blood that was spilled in Jerusalem is pure as long as it is for the sake of Allah. Every martyr will be in heaven and every wounded person will be rewarded by Allah's will.' Again, I remind the reader that it was with Abbas that Israel had to negotiate a two-state solution.

Once the green light to kill Jews had been given by the PA President, and with the prospect in view of a martyr's customary carnal rewards in paradise and material rewards for their families paid for by you, the reader, more attacks were sure to follow. Beginning on October 1, 2015, in Jerusalem, and at other locations in the West Bank and in Israel itself, Jewish civilians were the targets of a series of shootings and stabbings, which by early December, had resulted in more than twenty deaths. This time it was the turn of Fatah Central Committee member and Presidential adviser Sultan Abu Al-Einein to salute their murderers: 'The lions of Allah in Jerusalem are protecting it, kiss their foreheads and do not forget their hands'.

Within days came more stabbings, shootings and a car-ramming of pedestrians, leading to the killing of seven more Jewish civilians in Jerusalem, including a couple murdered in front of their four children. As always after the murder of Jewish civilians, those who carried them out were commemorated in the time-honoured manner. On November 2, 2015, *Al-Hayat al-Jadida*, the official PA daily, reported that a football tournament held at the 'Martyr [sic] Yasser Arafat Youth Centre' had been named after the assassin Muhannad Halabi. This was in addition to the naming of a street, as reported by the Palestinian news agency *Donia Al-Watan* on October 14, 'to honour Halabi, who carried out the stabbing and shooting operation against settlers [i.e., civilians] in the occupied Old City of Jerusalem'. 'The least we could do', according to the local mayor. Starting in October 2015, the number of attacks on Jews had reached 228, with 28 proving fatal, by the third week of February 2016, yet again, with scant if any coverage by infidel media.

The image that many even beyond the left have of the Palestinian Authority (and here we refer only to its Fatah wing, and not the avowedly theocratic Hamas) as a forward looking, essentially secular body, if it were to be a true one, would require that women under its rule should have a far better deal than in Islamic states governed strictly by Sharia law. The facts, as reported in the PA's own press, tell us otherwise. On November 24, 2014, the PA official daily, *Al-Hayat Al-Jaddida*, carried a feature complaining that Palestinian men were using the *legally acceptable* motive of 'honour killing' to justify the murder of women for motives other than male 'honour', such as disputes over property: 'Why is it nevertheless claimed that the murder was committed in defence of "honour"? Because this is the legally accepted [sic] claim to alleviate the verdict. The murderer uses the motive of family "honour" as a sure way of shirking the penalty for the crime, by electing the

mediatory circumstances prescribed by the current legal code.' So by its own admission, the legal code of the body that has won recognition by the European Union and several of its individual states as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, accepts 'honour' as valid grounds for killing a woman. And, the article added, such cases were 'on the rise'. Add wife beating and rape, also acknowledged to be rife on the West Bank (remember, this is not Gaza), and a clear picture emerges of the hell that is life for women under the supposedly enlightened rule of the Palestinian Authority. Ask our Sharia leftists and assorted feminists their opinion on the status of women under the PA, and how it compares with that in Israel, and they will probably do one of three things:

- 1) Dismiss the facts as Zionist lies, even though reported by PA media;
- 2) Demand that we see such things 'in context', that is, accept that this is a culture with its own norms that we westerners have no right to judge; and that anyway (*a la* Lindsey German and Laurie Penny) we are just as bad, if not worse;
- 3) Counter by arguing that raising the issue is a typical Zionist device to divert attention away from the infinitely worse crimes of Israeli Jews, such as genocide and apartheid.

The Jerusalem synagogue murders illustrated the two faces of the Palestinian Authority. Pursuing, with some success, western diplomatic recognition, it said what gullible European politicians wanted to hear, going through the motions of a condemnation of the killings by the 'President's Office', which then went on, at greater length, to attribute the murders to the 'provocations' and 'incitements' of Israel. Fatah, to which Abbas belonged, was naturally more concerned with preserving its militant domestic profile than appeasing world opinion, and took a different tack, explaining on November 19 that the statement had been made 'within a diplomatic context' and that Abbas was 'forced to speak this way to the world'. In other words, the condemnation was a lie, one that Sharia law (for example *Fatwa* 27261) allows if the purpose is to deceive the infidel in the cause of Islam. And the *Koran* tells Muslims that even Allah lies when it suits him: 'Allah is best [sic] of the deceivers'. (Chapter 3, Verse 54) So why not Muslim politicians?

In the aftermath of the Gaza conflict, the *Guardian* (again, where else?) on November 14, 2014, carried a feature by a Hamas official, Ahmed Yousef. Its main purpose was to justify, and at the same time render innocuous, the anti-Semitic articles of the Hamas Covenant. Deploying the post-modernist device of 'contextualisation', the Covenant was depicted as little more than a 'rallying cry', some of whose specific demands, especially those aimed at the Jews, were not to be taken at their face value. That is how far too many, including Jews, reacted to identical threats in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. History has surely taught all but the most obtuse what to expect from a movement or regime that has its 'rallying cry' death to the Jews. Yousef clearly had not been monitoring Hamas Al-Aqsa TV broadcasts, because if he had, on February 28, 2010, he would have seen the Hamas Deputy Minister of Religious Endowments, Abdallah Jarbu, deliver a diatribe against the Jews that was purely Nazi in its hatred and genocidal intent:

[The Jews] are thieves and aggressors...They want to represent themselves to the world as if they have rights, but, in fact, they are a microbe [sic] unparalleled in the world. It is not I who says this. The *Koran* itself says it: "You shall find the strongest men in enmity to the believers to be the Jews." May He annihilate this filthy people who have neither religion nor conscience. I condemn whoever believes in normalising relations with them, whoever supports sitting down with them, and who ever believes that they are human beings. They are not human beings. They are not people.

Thus spoke one of Corbyn's 'friends'. Just another 'rallying cry' perhaps? No amount of post-modernist 'contextualisation' can conjure away the meaning and purpose of these unequivocal declarations of genocidal hatred, and of solidarity with men who were nothing but hired assassins, or the reality that these 'soldiers of Allah' killed their victims, total strangers, simply because they were Jews. Yet while world leaders - or rather some - condemned their atrocities, they had no words of even the mildest criticism for the PLO officials who publicly incited and praised them. At all costs, including that of the truth, the image of a secular, moderate Palestinian Authority, worthy of receiving diplomatic recognition, and with which the West, and even Israel, could and should do business, had to be preserved.

As already noted, UK Government 'Faith' (sic) Minister, the Muslim Tory peer Baroness Warsi, had her own peculiar Islamic take on the synagogue murders. Her anti-Israel bias had already been publicly advertised during the Gaza conflict of the previous year when she accused the Israeli Defence Force of deliberately killing 'hundreds [sic] of kids'. The Jews at prayer had been killed because they had been 'storming' the Jerusalem Al-Aqsa Mosque, whereas they were legally praying in location that was sacred to Jews as well as Muslims. Neither of these comments seemed to have caused her party leader any problems, more than likely because like Labour, the Tories always had one eye on the Muslim vote, ten times larger than the Jewish one. But she then pushed her luck once too often when she opposed arms UK arms sale to Israel, and was obliged to resign. After her fall from Tory grace, in the run up to the General Election of May 2015, Warsi became involved in a campaign to encourage UK Muslims to become more involved in the political process. This led to her collaboration with two organisations that also had this as their stated aim, YouElect, and Mend, (Muslim Empowerment and Development). So far, so good. However, heading both of these organisations were Muslim men (of course) whom Baroness Warsi would have been well advised to keep clear of if she wished to maintain her reputation as a modern, reform-minded Muslim woman. But it seems she chose not to do so. One of YouElect's most prominent officers was Jamil Rashid, who doubled up as the Director of the London-based Muslim Research and Development Foundation, which in turn functioned as the 'think tank' for Haitham al Haddad, a notorious anti-Semite who had described Jews as 'the enemies of Allah' and democracy as 'filthy'. He made it clear in a Mend video that he endorsed the Muslim vote campaign only on the strict understanding that for him, its sole purpose was to bring nearer the day when, with Muslims by this time presumably in a majority, they would vote to create a true Islamic, Sharia-based society. This would, in its turn, be a prelude to 'spreading Islam all over the world'. He had also advised Muslims not to integrate into British society... 'it's simple as that'. In the wake of the 'Jihadi John' scandal that revealed CAGE's links with Jihadism, Rashid came very publicly to its defence, declaring that 'we stand with them in all their endeavours'.

Mend, naturally, had also spoken for up for CAGE. Lavishly funded, as always, with a large team of full-time organisers, Mend, together with the Sharia left, including Ken Livingstone, lent substantial support to the corrupt gangster politician Lutfur Rahman's illegal election campaign to become Mayor of the London East End Borough of Tower Hamlets. Its star speaker was Abu Easa Niamatullah, who was billed to address five of Mend's six pre-election meetings. Featured to appear alongside Niamatullah at a Mend function in Manchester on April 3 was none other than Baroness Warsi, who had always presented herself to the public as a Muslim woman with strong views about gender equality. This was of course entirely to her credit. But then, in which case, why had she, the emancipated Muslim career woman *par excellence*, agreed to share a public platform with someone who held views on women such as the following? 'I am an absolute extremist in this issue in that I don't have any time for the opposing arguments. Women should not be in the work place whatsoever. Full stop. I simply can't imagine how we can safeguard our Islamic identity and build strong Muslim communities in the west with women wanting to go out and becoming employed in the hell that is out there.' This presumably included Baroness Warsi's place of employment, the 'hell' of the House of Lords. From a strict Islamic standpoint, Niamatullah believed it to be forbidden for Muslims to handle or have on their persons British coins and banknotes, because they carry the image of a *kuffar* woman, Queen Elizabeth II. Niamatullah's views on the value of democracy were equally those of an 'absolute extremist'. What he called the 'inherent weakness of democracy' was that it was 'all down to the masses, to the people, to decide what is right and what is wrong'. But these same 'masses' were the very people the Mend campaign was supposed to be encouraging to vote. According to Niamatullah's reasoning (for want of a better term), because these 'masses', being no better than 'animals', could not be allowed to rule, it had to be 'the creator who should decide what the laws should be'. There was nothing novel in Niamatullah's opinions concerning the alleged political incapacity of the 'masses'. It was as old as politics itself and had been used to justify every form of rule except democracy, from slavery, feudalism and monarchy to military Juntas and modern totalitarianism and, of course, in this instance, Sharia theocracy. Under each, the 'masses' are held to be unfit to govern themselves, a task that therefore had to be entrusted, as in Plato's *Republic*, to an all-wise, all-powerful but still mortal 'Philosopher King', in Nazi Germany, a *Fuehrer*, in the Soviet Union, a General Secretary, or, as in Islam, to Allah and his representative on planet Earth, a Caliph, Imam or an Ayatollah. To put it bluntly, this preacher, by any normal non-Islamic standard, was a reactionary religious crank, and yet he obviously enjoyed enormous prestige and respect in the 'Muslim community', so much so that Warsi evidently believed it was necessary to share a platform with him.

This episode should tell us something about the prevailing cultural level of that same 'community', and help to explain the failure of many of its politicians to make a positive contribution to British political life. The reason resides chiefly in their instinct to act and think, always and in every situation, as a Muslim and not as politician of a secular political party. Most politicians of other faiths don't behave like this, so why should Muslims? They forget, ignore, or perhaps never understood in the first place, that an MP, once elected, or a Minister, once appointed, as in Warsi's case, irrespective of how many votes or support he or she believes they may have garnered from adherents of their own faith, has as their constitutional

duty the representation of all the people (not just voters) of their constituency, or government they serve, and certainly not just those of their own religion. If they truly believe, as many, judged by their conduct and even what they say, evidently do, that the first duty of a Muslim politician in the UK is to serve and obey Allah in all things, then, instead of using a secular political party for ends that are totally alien to it, let them stand openly as candidates for Allah, as in fact some Muslims have done, and then see how many votes that brings them, including from Muslims. Until aspiring Muslim politicians, or better, politicians who just happen to be Muslims, learn these lessons, which are essentially to do with overcoming Islamic resistance to integration, the scandals and farces will continue.

We have already seen how two Muslim Labour MPs and three Muslim Peers sprang to the defence of Islam as the religion of peace when the *Koran* was quoted by the accused as the justification for their murder of fusilier Lee Rigby. Disgraced former Labour Peer Baron (no less) Nazir Ahmed of Rotherham (sic) is perhaps the best example of how a politician of a mainstream party can reveal themselves as a loose cannon when their faith is at stake. With the Muslim population of the UK at 4.8.% of the total, a birth rate twice the national average, one birth in ten being to Muslims parents, and the most popular boys' name being Mohammed, all three main UK parties court the Islamic vote, as it has been shown that it is both large enough and located in the right areas to decide the outcome of a closely-fought general election. Baroness Warsi was obviously intended to serve as the Tory's tame (though as it turned out, not tame enough) and token Muslim, appointed to the newly-created post of Minister of Faith (not 'faiths' be it noted) in what was still, technically at least, a Christian country. How a devout Muslim was to promote the welfare of a faith which her own was dedicated to eliminate or, at the very least, subjugate, was something that was never explained, and it is difficult to see how it could have been.

Labour has traditionally been the party that has attracted the bulk of the Muslim vote. But not, at least until the advent of Corbyn, had it been the result of an appeal to their religion. This vote is chiefly cast by those whose origins, however many generations back, derived from the Indian sub-continent, and who traditionally voted according to strictly secular factors, such their social and economic situation, and the justified perception that Labour, until its Corbyn-inspired upsurge of anti-Semitism (hardly likely to trouble Muslims), had been far less, if indeed it had been at all, infected with racial prejudice than the Tories. But, under the 'New Labour' leadership of Tony Blair, rather than take the rapidly increasing 'Islamic' vote for granted, Labour, like the Tories, fast-tracked Muslims into higher echelons of the party. The quickest and easiest way to do this was to bypass the democratic process by elevation to the House of Lords, as was the case with Baroness Warsi for the Tories, and Baron Ahmed for Labour. And, just like the Warsi appointment, that of Ahmed proved to be the proverbial 'ticking time bomb' or if you will, loose Baron. Blair, like so many devout Christians (he officially converted to the Roman Catholic Church after leaving office) was, and has remained, greatly enamoured of Islam. The fact that the love was not, and could not be reciprocated, never seemed to dim the ardour. In March 2000, he informed *Muslim News* that he carried a copy of the *Koran* 'wherever I can. It gives me inspiration and courage'. Not the Bible, the book of Blair's faith, but...the *Koran*, which repeats, over and again, do not take Christians (and Jews of course) as friends. But there was more. The *Koran* conveyed 'the concept of love and fellowship as the guiding spirits of humanity'.

'Love and fellowship'? Towards the Jews? And Christians? Polytheists? Atheists? Gays? Women? What version of the *Koran* had he been reading? Obama's? Or the Pope's?

Blair's benign image of Islam was destined to detonate in his face not only literally, with the London Muslim suicide bombings of July 7, 2005, but in the person of Baron Ahmed. Pakistan-born Nazir Ahmed, who listed his occupation as the totally parasitic one of 'property developer', one usually more likely to result in Tory party membership, served in Rotherham (of Muslim gang rape infamy – see Chapter 27) as a magistrate and councillor, and was raised to the peerage by Blair in 1998. The motives behind his elevation quickly became evident when he led the first ever delegation by a UK government on a pilgrimage to Mecca. (!!!) Perhaps assuming that his status, profile, and unique and valued role rendered him untouchable, in due course he began, like Warsi, to reveal his own Islamic, rather than Labour agenda. In 2005 Baron Ahmed hosted a book launch in the House of Lords for the writer Israel Shamir. Baron Ahmed must have known that Shamir was an anti-Semite, because in his writings he made no attempt to conceal the fact. At the book launch, he explained in time-honoured fashion how the Jews operated: 'The Jews like an empire [sic...and Islam doesn't?] ...This love of empire explains the easiness Jews change their allegiance...Jews own, control and edit a big share of the mass media.' Russian-born but then Swedish Shamir, a convert to Orthodox Christianity from Judaism, was also on record as claiming that the Jews 'rule over the minds and souls of Europeans', that there were no gas chambers in Auschwitz, and that 'Palestine is not the ultimate goal of the Jews - the world is', thus echoing the Hamas Covenant, the *Protocols* and Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, in Arabic, *Ly Jihad*. This was the avowed anti-Semite and Holocaust denier that Baron Ahmed saw fit to invite as an honoured guest speaker to the House of Lords. When questioned as to his role in the scandal, Baron Ahmed refused to offer any explanation. However, shortly before his resignation from the Labour Party after charges were brought against him of anti-Semitism, Baron Ahmed stated that the accusations made against the Jews by Shamir were all true.

Once the dust had settled, and evidently feeling that his own Islamic and, as later events proved, anti-Jewish agenda could still be pursued with impunity, in 2006 Ahmed signed an Open Letter to Prime Minister Blair attacking his government's foreign policy, which it construed as anti-Islamic (here echoing Corbyn). Yet was it anti-Islamic when twice, the same government participated in US-led military actions to protect Muslims in Bosnia and Kosovo from Serbian 'ethnic cleansing'? (True to form, Corbyn, along with most of the far left, on these two occasions sided with the 'cleansers', since the Muslims were being protected by 'western imperialism', here, as always, the main enemy.) Then, on June 19, 2007, Baron Ahmed made his next freelance foray on behalf of Islam, joining with the *Daily Mail* and prominent Tories in attacking the knighthood awarded to Nobel Prize winner Salman Rushdie, the notorious, for Muslims (but shamefully not only Muslims) author of *The Satanic Verses*. Ignoring the fact that the campaign of mob violence against the writer had been unleashed, not by Rushdie, but by a *fatwa* death sentence issued by a Muslim, Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran, Ahmed attacked his patron Blair for recommending the award, and absurdly denounced Rushdie as the man who 'provoked violence all around the world', who therefore had 'blood on his hands'. Some could see that Ahmed's allegiance to the Labour Party was evidently wearing thin (had it really been anything else?) and there were rumours that he was

about to defect to the Tories. Although Ahmed denied this, there were indeed grounds to think otherwise, because in the general election of 2005, it later emerged that Ahmed had canvassed on behalf of a Muslim Tory candidate against Labour in the heavily Islamised Dewsbury constituency. The candidate's name? Sayeed, later Baroness, Warsi.

Nevertheless, Ahmed's career continued to prosper. He surely still must have believed that as Labour's token Islamic high flyer, he was indeed untouchable. But on December 1, 2007, *kismet*, the fate that all Muslims believe guides every mortal's destiny, took a hand in Ahmed's affairs. After his involvement in a fatal road accident, the Baron appeared in court and pleaded guilty to using his mobile phone moments prior to the collision. He was subsequently sentenced to 12 weeks in prison, due to the incident's 'aggravating features'. This case had a revealing sequel. In 2010, with his career as a Labour politician on the slide, he emerged from the closet as a fully blown Muslim anti-Semite, inviting to speak at a Parliamentary function another fellow anti-Semite, James Thring, who four years later, was a speaker at a similar event hosted by Corbyn. Finally, in April 2012, Ahmed gave an interview to a Pakistani TV channel in which he claimed that his conviction had been due to media pressure exerted by Jewish-owned newspapers and TV channels, and that the judge in his case had been selected because he had previously favoured Jews. The anti-Semitic cat was now well and truly out of the bag. The Jewish plot against himself, Ahmed claimed, arose because he had gone to Gaza 'to support the Palestinians'- more accurately, Hamas (again, just like Corbyn, who visited Gaza in 2002). In the light of his political associations, his anti-Semitism and what had proved to be his true allegiances, it perhaps would not be too unkind to suggest that Baron Nazir Ahmed should drop the last letter of his first name, just as for the same reason, Labour MP Naz Shah should add the same one to her first.

So far as his career as a Labour politician was concerned, this proved to be the end for Ahmed. It was one 'gaffe' too many, even for a 'flagship' Muslim. Summoned to appear before the Labour Party National Executive to face charges of anti-Semitism, and unable to refute them, Baron Ahmed pre-empted his very probable expulsion by resigning from the Labour Party on May 13, 2013, his political career, for the time being at any rate, in ruins. Inevitably, his downfall was seen by Muslims as the work of the Jews. The Pakistani English language daily, *The Nation*, carried a comment on the Ahmed affair by the UK-based Islamic 'Kashmir Watch International', which saw it as proof that the Baron had 'been made the target of a deep-rooted vendetta by his rivals - mostly the Jewish lobby - for his "crime" of exposing the increased anti-Muslim approach and policies of the Jews, including their [i.e., Jewish] backed British media'. Then, on March 1, 2019, came the news that Ahmed had been charged on two historic counts dating back to the 1970s of attempting to rape a girl, and one of indecent assault of a boy under 13. Two other Muslim men, were each charged with a similar offence against a boy under 13. Ahmed, the reader will recall, made his Labour debut as a Rotherham councillor. (For the Council's, and therefore probably Ahmed's collusion in the town's Muslim rape industry, see Chapter 27)

Racketeering is second nature to many Muslim politicians, even to those who have been born and bred in the UK, and so cannot be said to have honed their skills in an Islamic country. Some will go to extraordinary lengths, including fraudulent postal voting, to carve out for themselves a niche within a political system their religion rejects, from where they can then both feather their own nests and distribute

favours when and where the need arises. The most recent example is what experienced neutral observers were convinced was a rigged by-election in Peterborough on June 6, 2019, won narrowly by Labour with the help of a massive Muslim postal vote, and a campaign directed by a former Muslim Labour councillor who had been jailed for voting fraud in a previous election. The winning candidate was Jewish conspiracy theorist and Palestine Solidarity Campaign activist candidate Lisa Forbes. (See Appendix T)

The prize for deviousness in the pursuit of office however must surely go to Afzal Amin, until March 22, 2015, the prospective Muslim Tory Party parliamentary candidate for the highly marginal Labour seat of Dudley North. Amin was recorded and caught on camera outlining his plan to win the seat to someone he assumed to be a co-conspirator, and it went like this. In a secret deal with the anti-Islam campaigning movement, the English Defence League, a demonstration by the EDL would be called to oppose the construction of a mega-mosque in Dudley. This would raise no eyebrows, because this was just the kind of activity the EDL regularly engaged in. Enter Afzal Amin. In the interests of what he described as 'community cohesion', Aziz would convene a series of summit meetings involving himself, the EDL and the Chief of Police for Dudley. In collusion with the EDL, these meetings, step by step and with the maximum possible publicity, especially for Amin, would finally arrive at resolution of the conflict. The EDL would call off the demonstration it never intended to hold, the no less non-existent plan to build a mega mosque would be cancelled, and Aziz would thus emerge as the triumphant peace maker. In return, he promised, if elected, that he would prove, quote, an 'unshakable ally' of the EDL in Parliament and help to bring the anti-Islamic movement 'out of the shadows' and 'into the mainstream' of British politics. The Muslim Amin asserted that he agreed with '95%' of the EDL's policies.

The plan to get out the Tory vote seems to have involved a division of labour. Having raised his profile as a Muslim who had blocked the (non-existent) EDL march against the (also non-existent) proposed new mosque, Aziz obviously and rather naively thought this would be sufficient to capture a large slice of the traditional Muslim Labour vote. The EDL's part in the operation was to carry out the same task amongst white voters, this time by exploiting Aziz's military credentials. The plan was, said Aziz, for 'two white working-class lads to go around the area to say to people, "You support the army, If you support the troops, vote for this guy". That's what I need.' In total violation of electoral laws, canvassers were to be paid £250 per week for the duration of the campaign. In effect, Aziz was planning to run two parallel campaigns, one as a devout Muslim, and another as a patriotic UK ex-serviceman. This crazy scheme was surely doomed to fail even if it had not been exposed. And yet Aziz was not your average, over-ambitious, out-of-his-depth, small town Muslim politician. He had ideal Tory pedigree, having trained at Sandhurst and risen to the level of Captain. He even enjoyed close connections with the Windsors, serving as Army Education Officer to princes William and Harry. What more could one ask for, especially of a Muslim? So we can safely assume that the Tories, until they were forced to suspend Aziz after the scandal was exposed by the EDL, had every reason to expect great things of him, perhaps in good time rising as high in the Tory establishment as the former Muslim Faith Minister Baroness Warsi. As it turned out, another bent Muslim politician bit the dust...and who could feel sorry him?

Lastly, there is the scandal of Lutfur Rahman, the legally unseated ex-Mayor of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. Expelled from the Labour Party for his links with Islamic terrorism (this was pre-Corbyn) and then fraudulently elected in May 2014 on an independent but in effect Sharia left-endorsed Muslim ticket, in April 2015 he was deemed by Judge Richard Mawrey Q.C. to have gained and then exercised office by illegal and corrupt means. The action had been brought by retired film maker Andy Erlam, who in his efforts to secure Rahman's removal, came up against the usual institutional resistance to act on accusations and evidence of large-scale Muslim criminal behaviour: 'It seemed to me that the Metropolitan Police had been protecting Mr. Rahman for years. [shades of that enjoyed by Rotherham's Muslim rape gangs] Their investigation of electoral fraud seemed as though they were going through the motions...the authorities were afraid of being accused of racism [shades of Rotherham's Labour Council] ...I believe that strong elements of the local police were corrupt.' [shades of Rotherham Police] Judge Mawrey, who described Rahman as 'corrupt', 'ruthless' and a liar, also said Rahman had used the fear of 'accusations of racism and Islamophobia' to silence his critics. A familiar story. This too could just as easily have been Rotherham, Oxford, or any other city where Muslims have benefited from political correctness to evade investigation into their criminal activities.

Following Rahman's removal from office, the Sharia left, which had backed his illegal election campaign, now came to his defence. Though not disputing any of the many charges of corruption upheld by Judge Mawrey, the *Socialist Worker* claimed that Rahman had been the victim of a 'long Islamophobic witch hunt', though it was one that, strangely, did not have the support of the (capitalist) Metropolitan Police, who like their counterparts in Rotherham, Oxford, Rochdale and Buckinghamshire and elsewhere, had been too busy pursuing what is euphemistically called 'community policing' to notice that Tower Hamlets was also being ruled by a Muslim gang, though in this instance, not of rapists and pimps, but of political enforcers. A public meeting in support of the corrupt and disgraced Rahman was duly held under the Orwellian rubric of 'Defend Democracy in Tower Hamlets', with the usual platform of Sharia left speakers from SWP fronts, including the veteran *dhimmi* a feminist Lindsey German (this time dumping the Shibboleth of legal voting), the Stalinist Andrew Murray of the Stop the [Western] War Coalition, later to be appointed as adviser to Corbyn, and Weyman Bennett of Unite Against [non Islamic] Fascism. Given the scale of ethnic (I would add religious) voting fraud in the UK revealed in the subsequent official report by Sir Erick Pickles, it was entirely predictable that a government proposal to crack down on this criminal practice by requiring voters to produce evidence of identity would be opposed by a Labour MP on the grounds that this eminently sensible measure discriminated against 'poorer voters'...code for Muslims fraudulently voting Labour.

The same political correctness that led to blind eyes and deaf ears being turned to Muslim corruption and organised crime enabled a large number of Islamic pressure groups, bogus charities, educational and legal organisations to find easy access to public funding of their segregationist and even in some cases, Jihadi agendas, while at the same ensuring that those in charge, together with their families, pocketed what they obviously believed was their rightful share of the proceeds. Once awarded charity status - and what public official in their right mind would deny it? - the cash rolled in, though little if anything serving the public good

came out. I will cite just one example of many where public money granted for one purpose was illegally used to serve another, not in this instance *Jihad*, but nepotistic graft. On February 9, 2012, the Charity Commission began an investigation into the affairs of a Swansea-based charity calling itself the All-Wales Ethnic Minority Association (Awema). More than four years later, in November 2016, the Commission announced its findings. Why the delay? The Commission explained that its investigation was ‘put on hold as the charity’s Chief Executive [Naz Malik] stood trial for fraud related to alleged misconduct during his employment at the charity.’

By far the largest ethnic group in Wales from outside the UK is Asian in origin, and within that minority, Muslims predominate; for example, more than 5,000 in Swansea out of a total population of 240,000. So, it is safe to assume that most of the beneficiaries of the charity’s services should have been, if it had lived up to its name, of the same faith as its Chief Executive. One of the main objectives of the charity was, according to a press report, to ‘improve the job prospects of people from minority communities.’ Improvements undoubtedly did take place, but they were confined largely to the life-style of the Chief Executive and members of his family. The Commission found that in addition to a large number of failings in its management, there was ‘a conflict of interest relating to positions held within the charity by Mr Malik’s family members, with two family members having significant control within the charity. The Trustees failed with their duty to manage the charity’s resources responsibly. The staff members spent charity resources on expensive hotels and staff meals, sporting events and on one occasion to pay a parking fine.’ As a consequence of these and many other failings, the charity had its funding by the Welsh Assembly and the Big Lottery Fund withdrawn, and went into liquidation.

18 Eastern Magic

The maxim 'the enemy of enemy is my friend' is as old as politics. Perhaps the two most spectacular instances of this policy both involved the Soviet Union; first Stalin's pact with Hitler in August 1939 that carved up Eastern Europe and unleashed the Second World, followed less than two years later by Churchill's offer of military and other aid to the USSR after the Nazi invasion in June 1941. Unlike the numerous concessions undertaken by the Sharia left to cement its alliances with Islam, British support for the Soviet war effort did not involve the jettisoning of any of the 'shibboleths' that are the cornerstone of western liberal democracy. as Churchill made abundantly clear:

No-one has been a more consistent opponent of Communism for the past twenty-five years. I will unsay no word that I have spoken about it. [But] We have but one aim and one single irrevocable purpose We are resolved to destroy Hitler and every vestige of the Nazi regime. From this, nothing will turn us, nothing. Any man or state who fights against Nazidom will have our aid. Any man or state who marches with Hitler is our foe.

It was, to be sure, an alliance of convenience, terminated, like Hitler's with Stalin, as soon as it had served its purpose. But while it endured, neither party expected its opposite number to cement it by making ideological concessions to its partner. As we seen, things are different with the far left. In order to ingratiate itself with its 'friend' of the moment, it will make any number of concessions of principle, ditching once hallowed but now found to be encumbering 'shibboleths'. One of the many ironies in the Sharia Left's seemingly irrevocable commitment to its alliance with Islam is that was not always so. In the Balkan wars unleashed by the post-Tito collapse of Yugoslavia, a part of the left, led by the subsequently Islamophile Socialist Workers Party, far from defending the cause of beleaguered Muslims in Bosnia and Kosovo, instead, supported by Corbyn in Parliament, rallied to the defence of Russian-backed Serbian rapists and genocidists (the death toll is rated at around 100,000 Bosniaks), taking to the streets, this time with anti-communist exiled Serb chauvinists, against the reluctant and belated military support the western powers gave to the besieged Muslims. This apparent inconsistency can easily be explained. Then as now, the strategy was the same...the enemy of my enemy is my friend, the enemy in question being always the western democracies. It is the 'friend' that can vary, depending on the circumstances.

History is replete with similar examples of today's enemy becoming tomorrow's friend, and by the same token, *vice versa*, as in the examples cited. The classic case is the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and its Russian Federation successor. From the birth of the Soviet Union, and beyond its demise, the Kremlin's tactic of alliances veered between pragmatic accommodations with western democracies and outright hostility. Treated as a pariah state by Britain and France after First World War, the new Bolshevik regime concluded a treaty with another, Weimar Germany in 1922, followed by one with Fascist Italy. The threat of Nazi Germany then precipitated a not very serious flirtation with the western democracies, quickly abandoned when Stalin concluded his pact with Hitler in August 1939. Less than a

month later, Stalin joined with Hitler in the crushing and partitioning of Poland. The Nazi invasion of the USSR on June 22, 1941 then found Stalin fighting, not by choice, on the same side as the western allies, but within two years of Hitler's defeat, the Cold War had set in. After yet another rapprochement with the west under Gorbachev, a new Cold War was resumed by former KGB operative Putin, who drew Russia closer to its one-time communist rival, China.

Unlike the Kremlin's shifting alignments, the 'enemy' of the contemporary far left has been unchanging - western liberal democracy, ironically, the only political system that has ever allowed it to function freely, and whose tolerance of movements that despise its principles the far left, just like Islam, has always been prepared to exploit to the full, often in the name of freedoms it does not believe in. In the era of the Cold War, for many on the left (though not the SWP, which regarded the Soviet bloc and China as 'state capitalist') the Soviet Union and its satellites were, for all their glaringly obvious deformities, seen as an immovable bulwark against the west. George Galloway captured the essence of this stance when he revealed that 'the disappearance of the Soviet Union is the biggest catastrophe of my life', as was for Corbyn's Stalinist political adviser, Andrew Murray, the fall of the Berlin Wall. When rendered bereft by the demise of an idol, those who seek certainty must needs keep searching for a replacement, and Galloway, for all his Roman Catholicism, found what he yearned for in the tyrannies that ruled Iraq and Iran. For Murray, there was what he called 'People's [North] Korea' and, like Corbyn, Putin's Russia. (Because of his undisguised, Kremlin sympathies, in 2018, Murray, who was now serving as Corbyn's chief political adviser, was banned from entering Ukraine.) Others, some long before the fall of the Soviet Union, had tired of Russia's inertia and what they saw as its accommodations with the West, and had begun to look elsewhere for something more militant, defiant, heroic, ruthless, Spartan and even glamorous...third world dictators, Maoist China, Cuba, Nicaragua...even Albania and North Korea and, more recently, Chavez and Maduro in Venezuela...and Jihadis. Corbyn, never too fussy about who his 'friends' might be, so long as they stood up to 'the West', embraced them all, from Russia annexers, gay-hanging Ayatollahs and Latin American election riggers to Jew-killing-Jihadis.

The need of the far left for an anti-imperialist 'friend' continued after collapse of the Soviet empire and the transformation of China from a one-party Maoist dictatorship into a one-party capitalist dictatorship. Briefly, some hopes were pinned on the Russian-backed Serbian war criminal Slobodan Milosevic as a focus of resistance to the spread of liberal democracy into the Balkans. But already, encouraged by the upsurge of political Islam triggered by the rise of the Ayatollahs in Iran, attentions turned to the Middle East. Anti-Zionism, always popular with some on the left, now moved centre stage. Arafat, Assad, Gaddafi, Saddam Hussein, Khomeini (with whom Saddam went to war...accidents can happen) and their associated movements, became the new 'friends' on which much of the far left pinned its hopes. First in the field were two rival factions of the Fourth International, founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938 to supplant the Third, dominated by Stalin. As far back as the early 1960s, one tendency, headed by Michalis Raptis (aka Michel Pablo) threw its full weight behind the Algerian post-independence FLN regime headed by Ahmed Ben Bella, and until his overthrow in 1964, even held posts in Ben Bella's government.

Opponents of this orientation, which they dubbed 'Pabloism', saw it as an unwarranted accommodation with Arab nationalism. But that was all to change, and with a vengeance. By the time of the Arab-Israel war of June 1967, the UK Trotskyist group headed by Gerry Healy, the Socialist Labour League (later the Workers Revolutionary Party) which had initially denounced 'Pabloism' the loudest, now also became strident champions of Arab and Palestinian nationalism, especially that of Egypt's President Gamel Abdel Nasser and Arafat's PLO. This policy climaxed spectacularly ten years later when the WRP, after expelling most of its trade union members in the mid-1970s, and replacing them with high profile celebrities from the entertainment industry, most notably Vanessa Redgrave, found a new and highly lucrative sphere of activity when it established direct political links with, and financial dependency (amounting to millions) on not only the PLO, but a number of Islamic and Arab despotisms, principally those of Gaddafi and Saddam Hussein, and even feudal Gulf sheikhdoms.

Healy and Redgrave both had top level meetings with the WRP's paymasters during this period, from the late 1970s through to the party's implosion in 1985. In return for financial support, the WRP's press and political activities increasingly served as propaganda vehicles for Arab dictators, even to the extent of justifying in WRP publications the murder of their left-wing opponents, including (rival) Trotskyists, communists and anti-regime trade unionists, and photographing Iraqi exiles who demonstrated outside the Iraqi embassy in London against the WRP's fascist patron in Baghdad. To earn its keep, the WRP specialised in the arcane craft of identifying and naming Jews whom it believed were by stealth directing the political life of the UK (apart, that is, from the intransigently anti-Zionist WRP).

In the manner of the *Protocols*, the party announced in its press that it had discovered 'a powerful Zionist [i.e., Jewish] connection run[ning] from the so-called left [only the WRP was the real left] of the Labour Party right to the centre of Thatcher's government in Downing Street.' But not only in politics. Just as the *Protocols* and Hitler once claimed, the hand of the Jews (Corbyn on one occasion preferred 'the hand of Israel') was everywhere, especially in the media: 'Top of the list we have Mr Stuart Young, a director of the *Jewish Chronicle*, as youngest-ever [so?] chairman of the BBC. He is the brother of Mr David Young, another Thatcher, appointee, who is chairman of the Manpower Services Commission.' (In August 2012, Corbyn claimed on Iran's Press TV that he had detected a Zionist influence in BBC coverage of the Middle East, which he traced back to the London Israeli embassy. It was in this same transmission that he also claimed 'the hand of Israel' was behind a Jihadi attack in Sinai.)

Labour Herald, the long-defunct weekly journal printed in the 1980s by the Gaddafi and Saddam-funded WRP, and jointly edited by the then GLC Leader Ken Livingstone (until his suspension from the Labour Party on charges of anti-Semitism, Corbyn's defence adviser), his Deputy John McDonnell (Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor) and the veteran Healyite Ted Knight, waged an equally relentless campaign against what it claimed was the Zionist domination of the Labour Party orchestrated by the left MP Tony Benn, a prominent member of the PLP's Labour Friends of Israel. Like the WRP's daily, the *Newsline*, *Labour Herald* featured reports on the doings and sayings of the WRP's Arab benefactors, to the extent that from their contents, on some days it was hard to tell which paper was which. The WRP's unprecedented excursion into Arab politics is related in the hagiographic biography of its leader generated by two of his acolytes, Corinna Lotz

and Paul Feldman, one-time staffer for London Mayor Ken Livingstone, and prefaced by a no less reverential Foreword by Livingstone himself. Lotz and Feldman proudly related how Healy

played a central role in establishing a firm alliance with the Palestinian Liberation Organisation. He met its Chairman, Yasser Arafat, in Lebanon, along with his close comrades Abu Iyyad and Abu Jihad [sic]. Healy gave lectures on Marxism to PLO military cadres...Two films were made with the help of the PLO, *The Palestinians* and *Occupied Palestine*. [*The Palestinian's* anti-Zionist appeal reached far beyond the left, being hired for a screening by Australian neo-Nazis.] Vanessa Redgrave's public support and involvement in this work was a major boost to the PLO's international campaign for recognition as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people... In July 1977, following an abortive Egyptian invasion, the WRP and the General People's Congress of Libya signed a joint alliance pledging each party to a struggle against imperialism, Zionism, Fascism [sic] and colonialism. Healy met Colonel Gaddafi on a number of occasions, once even flying back to London in the leader's jet.

Anti-Zionism also attracted the attentions of leftists outside the ranks of the warring factions of the Fourth International. A hint of what was to come occurred in 1969, when on the anniversary of the Nazi 'Crystal Night' pogrom of the night of November 9-10, 1938, student leftists (yes, not Nazis, leftists) chose to commemorate, or rather celebrate this atrocity by staging an attack on a Berlin synagogue. The assault won praise from a fellow leftist, later Green Party activist, Dieter Kunzelmann, who argued that the left needed to challenge what he called 'the dominance of the Jew complex'. This was a task that the UK Sharia left undeniably has tackled with rare conviction and energy.

The 1970s also saw the rise of so-called 'urban terrorism' and with it, its obsession with anti-Zionism. Two notorious German urban terrorist grouplets comprised of 'drop outs' from bourgeois families, the 'Baader-Meinhof Gang' and the 'Red Army Faction', and a Japanese group of the same name, each established close links with the leftist Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, undergoing instruction in terrorism at a PFLP camp in Jordan in the early 1970s. Ostensibly at least anti-Nazis, the German Red Army Faction students were taken aback when they saw pictures of Hitler displayed at the camp, and told that he was a Palestinian hero. Whatever reservations it may have had concerning the PFLP's Nazi sympathies, they did not prevent the RAF publicly approving of the massacre of the Israeli team at the 1972 Munich Olympics, a combined operation planned with the assistance of Bulgaria's terrorist experts (acting as surrogates for the Kremlin) the PFLP and Arafat's Fatah, and using the sobriquet 'Black September'. The German urban terrorists' anti-Nazi credentials were, to say the least, ambiguous, and when it came to the Holocaust, bogus, something that became all-too evident at the trial of Ulrike Meinhof. Anti-Semitism, she explained, was 'essentially anti-capitalist [hence, 'the socialism of fools']... Auschwitz meant that six million Jews were murdered and carried onto the rubbish dumps of Europe for being what they were - Money Jews.' *Six million 'money Jews'*? It could just as easily be *Mein Kampf*, Hamas and Fatah TV, the *Protocols*.... or as we shall in due course see, a Corbynista website.

The PLO was only too willing to make available its 'training' facilities to any group, no matter what its political pedigree, the only qualification being a readiness

to join its war against Zionism. On that basis, 22 members of the West German Neo-Nazi organisation *Wehrsportsgruppe Hoffman* received training in terrorist techniques at a PLO facility at Bir Hassan in Lebanon under the instruction of Abu Iyyad, the WRP's contact man and member of Arafat's inner circle of Fatah leaders. In France, the PLO linked up with a shadowy French urban terrorist group to blow up a Paris synagogue in the Rue Copernic, which no fewer than three other envious Palestinian organisations subsequently claimed the honour of perpetrating. A variety of groups were drawn towards the PLO for reasons other than anti-Semitism, ranging from Irish to Basque and Armenian nationalists, seizing the opportunity to avail themselves of the PLO's generous supply of mainly Soviet arms and Lebanon's lavishly equipped training facilities. Well-healed revolutionary tourists, bent on soaking up the radical atmosphere, rubbed shoulders with real and at least for the moment, live terrorists. Terrorist tuition bore more tangible fruit than mere voyeurism in the case of the Japanese. On May 30, 1972, their RAF launched a bomb attack on passengers at Israel's Lod Airport terminal, killing 26 and wounding another 80. Four years later, with the German Red Army Faction either dead or behind bars, another German urban terrorist outfit, the 'Revolutionary Cells', now carried the torch of anti-Zionism, a cause that came and still comes all too easily to German leftists. Horst Mahler of the Red Army Faction finally came out as a fully-blown Nazi after his release from prison, while the Revolutionary Cells seriously considered assassinating, in the name of anti-Zionism of course, the head of the Jewish community in Germany, Heinz Galinski, and Simon Wiesenthal, the renowned Nazi hunter.

Wiesenthal was already the target of Nazi death threats, and later was only removed from a Palestinian hit list after the PLO was advised by the freelance assassin Ilich Ramirez Sanchez, 'Carlos the Jackal', to whom the 'contract' had been put out, that killing a Nazi hunter would harm the PLO's standing with the left. Some on the left possibly, but not those Jihadis for whom Hitler was a hero (Sentenced in 1997 by a French court to life imprisonment for a string of murders, Sanchez converted to Islam in 2001.) For good measure, Wiesenthal was also top of the hate list of the fervently anti-Zionist Socialist Chancellor of Austria, Bruno Kreisky. Kreisky, although himself a Jew, was as much opposed to Zionism as Wiesenthal supported it. It was Kreisky who in 1979 raised the PLO's profile by being the first western political leader to invite Arafat to make an 'official' visit to a west European capital. But Israel was not their only bone of contention. Wiesenthal had publicly criticised Kreisky's appointment in 1970 of four not so ex-Nazis to his cabinet; an astute move in what was then and still is now, with Poland, Europe's most anti-Semitic nation and which, true to form, elected former decorated *Wehrmacht* officer, Kurt Waldheim, as its President in 1986, and in 2000, voted into power the extreme right Freedom Party led by the unrepentant anti-Semite Jorg Haider. Haider never made any attempt to conceal his anti-Semitism, or his admiration for some of the policies of the Third Reich, and there was no reason why he should have done, since this stance worked in his favour in a nation still unable to rid itself of nostalgia for the time when the Jews had been put in their place and Austria's most illustrious son ruled all of Europe. Abroad, Haider pursued a policy of friendship with fellow anti-Semites Gaddafi and Saddam Hussein, and in return he and his party received from them a combined sum in excess of 80 million Euros. Even after the Holocaust, being openly anti-Semitic in certain parts of Europe can still pay handsome dividends, and not only among Muslims.

Then we have the extraordinary case of Kurt Waldheim. His meteoric ascent after the war began with employment in the Austrian diplomatic corps. He had wisely forged a CV that blotted out his part as an SS officer in Nazi atrocities in the Balkans, a dark secret that only came to light much later in his career. Nominated for the post by Kreisky, Waldheim had been elected Secretary General of the United Nations in 1972, defeating his only rival, the Finish (and Jewish) Socialist Max Jacobson, who had been vetoed by the Kremlin. A Soviet delegate explained off the record that his 'Arab friends' would 'never vote for Jew'. These 'friends' were given no reason to regret their choice. During Waldheim's term of office, in 1975, a resolution condemning Zionism as racist was carried thanks to the bloc vote of Islamic and Stalinist anti-Semites, the ground having been prepared the previous year, when the UN General Assembly had been addressed by the Jew-killing Palestinian terrorist Yasser Arafat. Waldheim, like the majority of delegates at the session who cheered Arafat's anti-Zionist diatribe to the echo, evidently saw no breach of UN protocol in the General Assembly being addressed by a representative of a terrorist organisation, the PLO, that was not only not a member of the United Nations, but was in a state of war with one that was, had been deliberately killing its civilians, had only two years previously sanctioned the operation that led to the murder of eleven members of its Olympic team in Munich, and whose stated central objective was to eliminate this state by means of 'armed struggle'. (PLO Covenant Article Nine).

Had those applauding Arafat forgotten that when Mussolini invaded Abyssinia in 1935, condemnation by the UN's predecessor for attacking a fellow member provoked fascist Italy's withdrawal from the League of Nations? If the invitation to Arafat was issued on the basis of his being the representative of an oppressed nation, why then was there no such opportunity afforded to a representative of the Kurdish people? This answer was, because, in this case, it would have been a matter not of cocking a snook at the Jews, but outraging Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria, all of whom occupied territories populated by Kurds. Exactly the same considerations governed the UN's withdrawal, after Chinese objections, of its invitation to the Dalai Lama to address the organisation's General Assembly. True, Tibet is not a member the United Nations, and if the rulers of China have their way, it never will be. But then neither is the Vatican City. Even so, the UN General Assembly has been addressed by the last three popes on no fewer than four occasions.

Further evidence of the anti-Israeli bias at work during Waldheim's term of office arose when membership of the UN International Energy Authority was denied to Israel because it listed its capital as Jerusalem, but was granted to the PLO, though it was not any kind of state, did not belong to the United Nations, and devoted such resources as it possessed to the destruction of a state that was. The UN Economic Committee for Western Asia adopted the same policy. It expelled Israel, the nation with easily the most successful and advanced economy in the region, and admitted the PLO, not a state or an economic entity of any kind, but a terrorist movement that everywhere it went, left a tail of death, despair and devastation in its wake and, in a manner true to its Islamic origins, lived by plundering and leaching off the work and wealth of others. Perhaps as a farewell gesture to the anti-Zionist cause that Waldheim's term of office had so blatantly promoted, in 1981 the UN issued a postage stamp bearing the legend, 'Inalienable rights of the Palestinian people'. Those who approved the wording on this stamp must surely have known that these 'rights', as defined in the PLO Covenant, could

not have been reconciled with the continued existence of the state of Israel, then as now a full member of the United Nations.

Waldheim was not the only culprit. Austria's role as standard bearer of European anti-Semitism continued when, in 1986 and no longer Chancellor, Kreisky, (who had himself lost 19 relatives to the Holocaust) lashed out against Wiesenthal's relentless pursuing of Nazi war criminals, denouncing him as a 'Jewish fascist' (sic) for his refusal to allow them to live out their lives in peace. For good measure, Kreisky, the classic self-hating Jew, described the Jews as a 'lousy people'. Later the same year, he called Israel a 'regime of apartheid' dominated by a 'semi-fascist ideology' - this from a politician who shared office with four not so ex Nazis and, prior to the election of 1975, proposed a coalition with the Freedom party, a political haven for former Nazis, whose leader, Friedrich Peter, had served in the East as an SS officer in a unit responsible for the murder of 400,000 mostly Jewish civilians. Were he still alive today, as the exemplary anti-Zionist 'self-hating' Jew, Kreisky for sure would be the ideal Patron for the Sharia left's Unite Against Fascism and Palestinian Solidarity Campaign.

Waldheim perhaps most clearly revealed his true Nazi colours in 1976 when, to secure the release of imprisoned Arab terrorists, German urban terrorists collaborated with a PFLP splinter group in the high-jacking of an Air France passenger jet that culminated in the famous Israel commando operation at Entebbe in Uganda. The UN Secretary-General denounced the Israeli rescue operation as 'flagrant aggression against the sovereignty of a member state of the United Nations', perhaps forgetting that he it was he who had approved the invitation to Yasser Arafat to address the UN on behalf of a movement that was also engaged, on a daily basis, in 'flagrant aggression against the sovereignty of a member state of the United Nations', and, unlike Israel's Entebbe Operation, with the sole purpose of bringing about its elimination.

Neither did Waldheim see fit to condemn the hijacking and, equally to the point, the collusion of the Idi Amin regime with its perpetrators, which made the Israeli operation in the circumstances necessary and morally justified. The fate that otherwise awaited the Jewish hostages became clear when the hijackers adopted a Nazi-style procedure of segregating them from the rest of the passengers, who were then released. And they could have expected no more mercy from the Hitler-worshipping Amin than from their Palestinian and German captors. In his letter to Kurt Waldheim justifying and praising the Black September massacre of the Israeli team at the Munich Olympics of 1972, an atrocity that unlike the Israeli rescue operation at Entebbe, neither the UN nor its Secretary General saw fit to condemn, Amin wrote:

Hitler and the German people knew that the Israelis [in this context he must have meant German Jews] are not people who are working in the interest of the people of the world, and that is why they burned over six million Jews alive on German [Polish actually] soil. The world should remember that the Palestinians, with the assistance of Germany, made the operation possible in the Olympic village.

Like his idol, Amin was no slouch himself when it came to mass murder. Amnesty International estimated the number of his (mainly by origin Asian) victims as being in the region of half a million. After his overthrow in 1979, which frustrated his intention to erect a statue of Hitler in Kampala, he lived out his last years in the

land that gave birth to his faith as a guest of the Saudi monarchy.

Entebbe was the last major anti-Israeli operation involving European urban terrorists. Hounded and largely rounded up by the police, and torn apart by factional squabbles, they faded from the scene, just when the WRP's sally into Middle Eastern politics was gathering momentum. Healy therefore had a clear field for his version of what might be called the 'eastern option', which he pursued with spectacular success over the next decade. In the mid-1980s, the implosion of the WRP, triggered when Healy was overthrown by a revolt of his own members after his exposure as a sexual predator, put in question the party's previously unchallenged claim to the Middle Eastern franchise. Some of the contacts were maintained, but the leverage Healy once exercised was gone. He spent his last years engaged in another 'Pabloite' exercise, promoting Gorbachev's failed attempt to reform the Soviet Union's decrepit economy and authoritarian political system. But the plunge into Arab affairs was only just beginning for Healy's far left rivals. Having for years denounced the WRP's financial dependence on and political subordination to Arab dictators, they now found themselves being propelled down the same path as Pablo, the urban terrorists and Healy...with one crucial difference. Each of these three had concluded their sordid deals with what was then a dominant semi-secular Arab nationalism. The Jihadi ascendancy in the Middle East - first Hezbollah, Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood, then ISIS and its affiliates - would in due course require an accommodation not so much with the largely spent forces of secular Nasserism and Ba'athism, but the holy warriors of Allah...hence the necessity to disavow and jettison yet more 'shibboleths' that were integral to traditional leftism.

The implosion of the WRP in 1985 left its long-time major Trotskyist rival, the Socialist Workers Party, as easily the largest far left organisation of its kind operating outside the Labour Party. Like all other such groupings, it was by this time feeling the effects of what it called 'the downturn', a general decline in the fortunes of the entire left, reflected in a steady fall in trade union membership and industrial action, a split in the Labour Party, three successive election victories for the Tories under Margaret Thatcher and, for those who looked east for their political inspiration in such hard times, the disintegration of the Soviet bloc and China's introduction of a market economy.

Almost uniquely on the far left, the SWP did not see these last two developments as a set-back for the cause, adhering as it did to the thesis that all the so-called communist states were in fact what it termed 'state capitalist', a unique form of capitalism in which the workers were collectively exploited by the state and its ruling elite and not by privately-owned companies. To such states, the SWP, and its forerunner, the International Socialists, therefore owed no more allegiance than to capitalist countries of the conventional type, a stance reflected in the caption on the masthead of the SWP's weekly journal *Socialist Worker*, which read: 'Neither Washington nor Moscow, but International Socialism'. Unlike the SWP, with rare exceptions, the rest of the far left, and in fact beyond into its mainstream, had adopted an attitude towards the Soviet bloc and China that can be best described as 'critical support'; critical (though often *sotto voce*) of their political regimes, but praise for their economic systems and support for Stalinist sponsored or infiltrated 'peace movements' that put the entire blame for the cold war on the west. This is where Corbyn, and others like him in the Labour Party, located themselves in those years. The IS, and with much justice it should be said, denounced this policy as at

best, an accommodation with, and at worst, a capitulation to Stalinism. All the more extraordinary then, given this record of intransigent opposition to all existing states, that the SWP became the foremost advocate on the Left of support for regimes and movements, initially that of the Ayatollahs in the Iran, then the Islamic State and its offshoots, and the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas and Hezbollah. And it was all the more so because, far from making any claims, however bogus, to being in any sense socialist, these regimes and movements had between them hounded, tortured and murdered leftists, trade unionists, secularists, gays and feminists, with a savagery and on a scale comparable to the darkest years of the Third Reich. As we have seen, the SWP's Alex Callinicos had prepared the ideological ground for this collaboration with his warning 'not to down the formula of our broad [sic] movement with all sorts of political [sic] demands.' Broad indeed, since it included genocidal anti-Semites, Islamic theocrats and Jewish conspiracy theorists.

Ironically, since 9/11, this new 'eastern orientation' towards Jihadi Islam and the states that sponsor it assumed for the SWP and beyond precisely the role that the Soviet bloc and China performed for the once scorned 'capitulators to Stalinism', a bulwark against Western imperialism and, as we have seen, maybe even an alternative path to Socialism. Inevitably this led to accommodations in matters of policy and principle on a scale to match the hugely disproportionate balance of forces in the partnership, to the extent that the caption on *Socialist Worker* should now have read, 'Not International Socialism but the Way of Allah'.

As the varieties of semi-secular Arab nationalisms (Nasserism, 'Gaddafism', the PLO and Ba'athism) lost ground to theocratic, terrorist and Jihadist Islam, so the far left, from the 1990s onwards having also experienced its own domestic stagnation and even decline, found itself tempted along new paths in exactly the same way and for the same reasons as the WRP two decades before. Just as Healy had out-Pabloed Pablo, so now what remained of the far left out-Healyed Healy. And also like the WRP, it made the necessary ideological and policy adjustments. Most spectacularly, Marx's 'opium of the people' almost overnight became, in its Islamic manifestation, their elixir in the form of 'militant Islamism'.

The extent (or rather the depths) to which the born-again Islamophiles were now prepared to take their endorsement of Jihadism and Sharia theocracy was demonstrated in 2014 by the far left-dominated UK National Union of Students' support for gender-segregated university meetings when addressed by Islamic speakers, and in the same year, at its annual conference, by voting down on the grounds of its 'Islamophobia' a resolution condemning the atrocities committed by ISIS, and expressing solidarity with Kurds threatened by genocide. It was the same story at the NUS conference of 2015 when, without debate or even a formal vote, it was agreed to work with the disgraced bogus Muslim 'human rights' organisation CAGE. This decision was taken not only after the exposure of its links with Jihadism, and after its director, Asim Qureshi, refused to condemn the atrocities committed by the ISIS 'Caliphate', but in the full knowledge that in a televised interview with Andrew Neil, Qureshi had evaded answering the question, do you support female genital mutilation and the enslavement of non-Muslims, with the reply, 'I'm not a theologian'. It was no more than a natural progression then that in 2022, the NUS elected as its President the hijabed Shaima Dallali, who had previously issued a call on social media for the extermination of the Jews, and praised the FGM approving, Hitler-admiring cleric Yusuf al-sei Qaradawi as the 'moral compass for the Muslim community at large'. These decisions spoke

volumes for the mental capacities and moral calibre of what aspires to be tomorrow's intelligentsia. Allah help us. Following an external (n.b.) investigation into NUS anti-Semitism, later the same year, Dallali was removed as President. (See Appendix XII)

19 Do Not Disturb

The emergence of the far left's orientation towards the Arab world and therefore, necessarily, Islam, had ramifications and repercussions that went far beyond the arena of conventional politics. It penetrated deep into western academic institutions. Its chief and most sinister feature was the drive to enforce what amounted to thought policing, primarily with the aim of protecting Islam from any serious criticism and suppressing organised support for the state of Israel. The Sharia-leftist drive to enforce a stultifying, sterile intellectual and political conformity by student union bans on the expression of certain opinions, far from meeting with any resistance by university authorities and staff, was officially endorsed and even extended. Of the 24-top rated Russell Group of Universities, 11 had by 2016 been given a 'red' grading, the highest of three, by Spiked, a website that monitored restrictions on free speech in the UK. Amongst those so listed in this elite group were Oxford (sic), Edinburgh, the London School of Economics, King's College London, Cardiff, Birmingham and Bristol. Only three, Exeter, Southampton, and York, received a 'green' ranking, indicating that here at least, free speech, albeit precariously, still survived. As we shall see, free speech on campus has been caught in a vice, from below by leftist and Muslim-dominated Student Unions acting in concert with from above, the very same university authorities that back in the heady days of 'student power' in the 1960s, were seen as 'the enemy', to be challenged on every possible occasion, for example by opposing the requirement of students to sit exams in order to qualify for a degree.

How times change. In politically correct 2013, the once Red but now 'red' rated LSE was the scene of one such pincer operation when, on the instructions of a student union official, two students manning the Atheist Society stand at a freshers' event were escorted by security staff from the premises when they refused to take off their 'Jesus and Mo' T shirts. It required the threat of legal action before the LSE issued a grudging apology. Even then, the LSE's Director, Professor Craig Calhoun, claimed that security staff had acted 'in good faith', the faith in question being Islam. Nearly two years on, this rebuff obviously still rankled, because in June 2015, Professor Calhoun resumed his attack on free speech and secularism, fulminating against student atheists who make 'free speech an issue' in of all places, a university. Atheist students had, he claimed, generated a 'controversy over cartoons' that had proved 'disruptive to campus harmony'. 'Controversy' on campus? Whatever next? But who precipitated this 'controversy'? It was the student union cartoon police, acting on their own initiative, not on a complaint of a student and, as it proved, also illegally. Even if a student had complained, their action would have still been illegal as well as wrong. Had a Muslim student been sporting a 'God is Great' T shirt, we can be sure that the two atheist students would have not complained, and that the Muslim student would not have been told to take it off or leave the building. As one would expect, these double standards also apply to many other aspects of campus life, including, incredibly, what reading matter is permissible. While more than thirty universities banned the sale of the allegedly 'sexist' *Sun*, a paper which, like countless painters and sculptors down the ages, regularly features images of semi-naked, consenting adult women, and has never advocated or defended rape or any other form of violence against the female sex, no university has banned two books

that do exactly that, the Bible (Deuteronomy 20: 14) and the *Koran* (22:222 and 4:34). Neither, for all their zeal in promoting the rights of homosexual men, does any university enforce a ban on the promotion and observance of religions whose sacred texts demand their murder and, in countries where Islam has the power to do so, actually carry it out. Indeed, there are universities that proudly inform applicants in their prospectuses that among the attractions on offer are a state-of-the-art mosque and a thriving Islamic society.

In the mid-nineteen sixties, beginning at the Berkeley University of California, campuses across the USA successfully demanded an end to bans on student political organisations. Known as the free speech movement, it was part of a larger political radicalisation that culminated in massive protests against the war in Vietnam and the denial of equal civil rights to blacks in the south. Yet today, despite its constitutional protection, free speech has become a dirty word on the same campuses. (See appendix B) The clamour is now for its suppression, to be enforced by the same authorities that denied it to their parents and grandparents half a century ago. In less than an hour, a free speech campaigner collected 50 signatures from Yale students (yes, *Yale*) for a spoof petition demanding the repeal of the First Amendment, one of whose five specified rights, in addition to freedom of speech, is to petition the government. As in the UK, so in the USA, universities swamped by political correctness were adopting a 'safe space' policy of banning topics for debate which, it was claimed, threatened campus 'harmony', or were likely to cause distress. The internationally famed M.I.T., the Universities of Michigan and the North East, Hampshire and Smith Colleges were among those institutions of learning which converted themselves into 'safe spaces' in order to protect student minds from ideas they might find upsetting. Michigan students were even asked to sign a pledge undertaking to use only 'inclusive language'. A list of forbidden words was thoughtfully provided.

Academics at US (and UK) universities are now required to warn their charges of prescribed course texts that might 'trigger' feelings of distress by students who read them, hence 'trigger warning'. Any book so listed ceases to be required reading, no matter how essential to the subject. One US seat of higher learning listed topics that might bring on such panic attacks: 'Racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, cissexism, [sic] ableism, and other issues of privilege and oppression'. Asked to comment on these policies, students in the USA have argued that restrictions on their own academic freedoms should take priority over the First Amendment, because freedom from being offended or otherwise distressed was more important than freedom of speech and unfettered intellectual inquiry. Hence 'snow flake' students. Added to this, as far back as 2003, a survey revealed that a quarter of US students were unable to even name the freedoms protected by the same amendment. It is truly frightening no less than it is tragic, that in the only country in the world that by law upholds the right of free speech, this onslaught on free expression and free thought should be meeting with little or no organised resistance from the country's political leaders and intellectual and cultural elites. Surely those students and academics with any knowledge of Europe's not so distant past should not need reminding as to the possible horrendous consequences of rearing its young in a climate of moral and intellectual conformity. Because, as in Germany in the last years of the Weimar Republic, what is occurring both in the UK and in the USA is a concerted campaign to roll back the gains for freedom of thought and inquiry won, at a huge cost, by the Enlightenment and the American

and French Revolutions, and defended at an even greater cost in the Second World War, and in their place, the imposition of a new McCarthyism, which like its prototype, sought to demonise ideas that were deemed to be subversive of the safety and well-being of the academic community and, by extension, society as a whole. And yet all such restrictions are, in the USA, in direct contravention of a ruling made by the its Supreme Court in 1967 stipulating that the First Amendment protection of free speech applied equally to academic freedom:

Our nation is [now, 'was'] deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedoms, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teacher concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom...Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always be free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilisation will stagnate and die.

The campus campaign against free speech took an ominous, even sinister turn on March 11, 2016, when the Republican front-running Presidential candidate Donald Trump staged a rally at Chicago's Illinois University. Leftist political opponents of Trump, together with a large contingent of Muslims, decided that contrary to the First Amendment, Trump should be denied the right to make his opinions known to US voters. Their organised disruption, led by chants of 'Fuck Donald Trump', achieved its purpose, which was that the rally had to abandoned even before it began. Jubilant student rioters, celebrating the victory of 'no platform' and 'safe space' thuggery over free speech, chanted 'we shut it down'. What these fascist-minded hooligans were demanding, and in this case as in others, successfully enforcing, was a 'no platform', 'safe space' 'responsible' free speech, free speech with a but, a free speech reserved for themselves but nobody else, the right of an organised, violent, fanatical clique to determine what could and could not be said in public about, in this case, the issue of Muslim migration and Islamic terrorism. The validity or otherwise of Trump's opinions on this or any other topic had no bearing whatsoever on his constitutional right, just like any other US citizen, to express them in public, including, one would have hoped, at a meeting held by his own organisation to promote his political campaign. The rioters also denied to US citizens their democratic right to hear what a candidate for the highest office in the USA had to say about his political intentions. The totalitarian thugs who forced the cancelation of Trump's rally in Chicago obviously thought otherwise. Like Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Mao, Saddam, Putin, Castro and Kim Jong-un, their ideal was an election with only one candidate, their own, and a platform with only one voice, also their own.

Two events on US campuses in the first week of February 2017 demonstrated just how far the left, allied with no less authoritarian-minded Muslims, was prepared to go in its war on freedom of speech in a country that alone in the world, afforded it the protection of the law. On the first of the month, Milos Yiannapolous, a libertarian conservative publicist known (or notorious) for his advocacy of free speech and his criticisms of Islam, political correctness and 'Third Wave' feminism, was due to speak at Berkeley University, home of the Free Speech movement of the 1960s. But that was half a century before. Berkeley in 2017 had become a bastion of safe spacism, offence prevention, trigger warnings and no-platforming, where a

Thought Police, if necessary, as on this occasion, by outright thuggery, decided what opinions could or could not be heard. Yiannapolous never got to speak. The event was cancelled, and the speaker evacuated from the university's premises on the grounds of security, because a gang of some 150 masked hooligans, reminiscent of the hooded fascist *Cagoullards* of nineteen thirties France, had rampaged across the campus committing acts of arson and vandalism that resulted in damage to university property valued at more than \$100,000. Instead of deploying the forces of law and order to protect the guest speaker and disperse and apprehend the hooligans, a university surrendered to premediated, fascistic mob violence rather than stand firm in defence of the USA's constitutional guarantee of the right to peaceful assembly and freedom of speech. And instead of denouncing this outrage, *Newsweek* generated its own 'fake news' and 'alterative facts', floating a preposterous conspiracy theory that Yiannopoulos was 'in cahoots with the agitators [sic] in order to lay the groundwork for a Trump crackdown on universities and their federal funding'. A week later, on February 7, Jonathen Brown was the guest speaker at the University of Georgetown. On this occasion, all went according to plan. There were no protests, peaceful or otherwise. Brown was provided, quite rightly, with a platform to air his view on a variety of topics, and the evening ended as it began, peacefully. I suggest this was in part at least because the speaker on this occasion was not a critic of Islam but its advocate, as it happened a 'white 'convert to the faith. Brown was the Director of the Alwaleed bin Talal Centre for Muslim-Christian understanding at Georgetown, and his topic was, 'Islam and the Problem of Slavery'. As his 90-minute talk developed, it became evident that Brown only had a 'problem' with slavery when practised by non-Muslims, as for example in the USA until its abolition by President Abraham Lincoln in 1863. Islamic slavery was a different matter entirely, since slaves owned by Muslims enjoyed, quote, 'a pretty good life', especially, I would suggest, the females ones, who enjoyed the extra kudos of concubinage. Warming to his theme, Brown claimed it was 'not immoral for one human to own another human', that is, when the 'owner' was a Muslim. (See Appendix E) It also followed, as least according to Brown, that when a Muslim raped a female slave (what the *Koran* calls 'the spoils of war' or 'booty') 'consent isn't necessary for lawful sex', again, so long as the law is that of the Sharia. Notions such as a woman's 'autonomy' and 'consent', said Brown, were merely western 'obsessions', an argument that we have seen advanced by Women's Studies Assistant Professor Laura Briggs of Arizona University. There were no protests from the women present.

Yiannopoulos in his speeches did not advocate rape or defend slavery, be it Christian or Muslim. I have seen him in action at his events, so I can vouch that he believes in and practices free speech for all, including for the likes of Jonathen Brown to advocate Muslim slavery and rape. Yet he was denied by violence and cowardice the right to criticise the religion which sanctions both, while someone who did advocate rape and slavery was listened to in respectful silence. This is the state to which the western intellectual world is being reduced by political correctness, born of a craven fear of being branded as racist or 'Islamophobic', and by an 'identity politics' that allows to pass unchallenged the advocacy of practices and the expression of attitudes that would in years gone by have been denounced as outrageous violations of the most basic values of a civilised society, for no other reason than they are proposed by the followers of a particular religion, or someone with the right genes.

Enforcing this clamp-down on free debate in the one arena above all others where it should thrive, across the USA, well organised and funded university Islamic Societies have on several campuses set out to intimidate into silence, with the participation of academic staff, anyone, Jewish or otherwise, who supports the right of the state of Israel simply to exist. Yet when the item on the agenda is the promoting of any number of Islamic, even Jihadi causes, everything goes smoothly, as it does in the UK. Just in the Autumn term of 2014, no fewer than 75 US universities staged anti-Israel events, usually with the support of academic staff and endorsement of college authorities, while public activities in support of Israel were sabotaged by outright thuggery. Support for the state of Israel on a growing number of campuses was as result driven underground. Anyone openly sympathetic to the existence of Israel was routinely denounced as a baby-killer and a Nazi by chanting Muslims and leftists whose hatred of Jews was as virulent as any Nazi of Third Reich vintage. Swastikas have been daubed on buildings with a Jewish connection, Jewish students physically assaulted and Jewish speakers at pro-Israel events shouted down with pre-arranged chants accusing Israel of apartheid and genocide, including by devotees of a faith that promotes and has practised both. Muslim and Sharia left terror tactics ensured that free speech and the right of assembly were all but eradicated on scores of campuses across the USA. So far as many Jewish students were concerned, the First Amendment had become a dead letter. The success of this offensive was due partly to a leverage exerted by Muslims on US campuses out of all proportion to their numerical strength, because it combined a readiness to use violence with the exploitation of political correctness, infidel guilt feelings about 'western imperialism' and an anti-Zionist Islamophilia that had engulfed much of the US radical intelligentsia. Here are two instances of many where these tactic were in play. In 2014, the prestigious Brandies University awarded an honorary degree to Hirsi Ali, a Somali Muslim turned atheist, for her courageous campaigning, in defiance of numerous death threats, on behalf of oppressed Muslim women on issues such as forced and child marriages and female genital mutilation, herself having been a victim of this latter practice when a child. Having lived her formative years under its regime of body and mind control, she had described Islam as 'the new fascism'. Not caring whom she 'offended', she also criticised, after witnessing it at first hand, the corruption endemic in the Palestinian Authority and, after visiting Israel, praised it for its 'liberal democracy'.

For exposing and denouncing the vicious treatment of women living under Sharia law, she was ostracised not only by most of the American left, which one would have naturally expected, but also by the 'feminist community', for whom attacks on Islam, as we have seen, are no less taboo. In all, hardly a CV to endear her to US Muslims and their Sharia leftist allies. And so it proved. Once the award was announced, the highly influential, Obama-endorsed Council on American-Islamic Relations, effectively, if not in name, the USA branch of the Muslim Brotherhood, swung into action, supported by aggressive campaigning on campus by Muslim students and Islamophile staff. Meeting with little or no resistance, they easily secured the reversal of the degree award, on the grounds of Ali's...yes, of course, her 'Islamophobia'. University authorities grovelingly confessed that by inviting her they had made a terrible mistake. Her humanist post-Islamic beliefs, previously worthy of an honorary degree, were overnight discovered to be incompatible with the institution's 'core values', which presumably included endorsement of female genital mutilation, wife beating, the murder of rape victims,

stoning to death of alleged adulterers, child brides, rape within marriage and all the other practices that go to make a Muslim woman's life such a joyful experience. In the same year, at the same University, a projected event on the persecution and killing of gay men and women in Yemen, Saudi Arabia and Iran organised by gay rights campaigner Dan Mael suffered the same fate when it was blocked by...yes of course, the University's Gay Rights group, which objected that the event was potentially Islamophobic. Yet as every politically aware western gay knows, unlike Israel and the imperialist west, which host annual gay pride marches, Islam imposes the death penalty for homosexual acts. First we had Sharia feminists denouncing an opponent of FGM. Now we had Sharia gays applying the same double standard, by which some gays, like some women, depending upon where they live, are more equal than others.

Just how far some US university authorities are prepared to go down this path of appeasing Islam was exposed in a scam at the Barry Roman Catholic University in Florida. Posing as a supporter of ISIS, a student was able with no difficulty to secure enthusiastic official backing for a proposed fund raising and solidarity campaign on campus for the terrorist 'Caliphate'. The proposed spoof organisation was to be called 'Sympathetic students in support the Islamic State of Syria and Iraq'. The videoed exchanges in part went like this:

Student: 'We could pass out IS flags and educate people...raise money and send it'.

Professor Pavena Sirimangkala: 'Good, good. Perfect [!].'

Derek Bley, Co-ordinator for Leadership Development [sic] and Student Organisations: 'We're not here to limit people and their clubs...We're here to get that done.'

The 'that' in question was promoting political and raising financial support for a movement which, as the staff in question must have been well aware, made videos of its captives being decapitated and burned alive in a cage, and had declared itself to be, and was, in a state of war with the USA. Given the prevailing virulent anti-Israel climate on many of the USA's campuses, it was easy enough to play the same scam on Ivy League Cornell University. On this occasion, the proposed action went far beyond mere fund raising. Incredibly, the university authorities approved a plan to establish an on-campus training camp for what were called ISIS 'freedom fighters'. With sympathies, such as these, it is hard to conceive of a similar endorsement being given so readily to a solidarity event on behalf of Israel. In fact, on many US campuses, the atmosphere has been not only virulently anti-Zionist, but explicitly anti-Jewish, and sometimes violently so. On May 7, 2002, at San Francisco State University, Jewish students needed police protection from Muslim students demonstrating in support of the Palestinians. After 9/11, Muslim students at the same university, echoing the insane claims of their co-religionists in the Middle East, expressed support for the conspiracy theory that the Jews were behind the attack on the World Trade Centre. This, from *university students*?

As was the case in the UK, well-organised and funded campus Islamic Societies could usually be assured of a sympathetic response when they demanded as they believed was their Allah-given right, the cancellation of invitations to speakers whose ideas they found 'offensive' and even, poor dears, distressing, threatening and intimidating. Such was the sequence of events in December 2007 at Milwaukee's University of Wisconsin, when the scheduled guest speaker in question was Walid

Shoebat, an apostate from Islam. The title of his address was 'Why I left *Jihad*'. Once again, as at Brandeis, the university's Islamic Society went to action stations, circulating an email that described Shoebat as a 'well known hate-monger', and co-authoring with the university's Palestinian Society (with which we can be sure there was a sizable overlap of membership) a letter to the university's governing body denouncing Shoebat as 'a well-known addict [sic] of hate [i.e., free] speech'. After listing a series of calamities that were likely to befall campus Muslims if Shoebat was allowed to address the student body, the letter concluded by asserting that 'Muslims at the UWM feel their safety will be in danger of the above event takes place on the UWM campus'. The initial response of the university authorities was to accede to the demands of the two societies by imposing a prohibitive financial charge on the sponsor of the event, the campus Conservative Society, for the provision of security, the need for which had been spuriously generated by dire Muslim warnings of impending violence. When this ruse was exposed, the university caved in, cancelling the security arrangements. The meeting went ahead as planned. There was no violence.

In November 2009, two Ivy League Universities, Colombia and Princeton, having initially invited Nonie Darwish, an Arab critic of Islamic Jihadism, to speak, both cancelled their invitations after protests by Muslims students. No such complication had arisen however when two years previously, Colombia extended an invitation to the then President of Iran, the Holocaust denier, anti-Semite and Corbyn's Press TV employer Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, to address the student body. There was, however, an extraordinary sequel, one that illustrated the leverage *dhimmitude* exerted within US *academe*. In the course of his introductory address, Colombia's President and First Amendment scholar (there's the rub), Lee Bollinger, took the opportunity to draw attention to human rights abuses in Iran, namely, that in the first eight months of 2007, the theocracy represented by Colombia's guest speaker had carried out 210 executions, two of which had been of children. Addressing Ahmadinejad directly, he asked, 'why have women, members of the Baha'i faith, homosexuals and so many of our academic colleagues become targets of persecution in your country?' He then cited the Iranian President's Holocaust denials, his avowed intention to destroy Israel, and his sponsorship of terrorism as likewise worthy of condemnation, all of which was proof that 'Mr President, you exhibit all the signs of a petty and cruel dictator.'

Then came the *dhimmi* back-lash. If, in the McCarthy era, a representative of or apologist for a Stalinist regime had been the object of a similar scorn, the speaker would have been cheered to the rafters as a defender of western freedom and democracy. But this was the era of a no less poisonous and dangerous conformism, in which America's new totalitarian enemies could not be damned but had to be cravenly exalted. Not even his harshest critics claimed that anything Bollinger said was untrue. The problem was that it was all true, and that its target was a Muslim. What made it even worse was that Bollinger stood on the liberal left, and had let his side down by denouncing an anti-American, anti-Semitic Islamic theocracy. Clearly, Bollinger had to be taught a lesson in good manners when addressing tyrants of the Mohammedan persuasion. 'Rude', 'offensive', 'embarrassing', 'undignified', 'ungracious', 'way out of line', 'undiplomatic', were just some of the epithets hurled at an academic who had dared to exercise his right under the First Amendment to denounce human rights abuses in Iran. It was not long before the pressure began to tell on Bollinger's gutless academic colleagues.

On November 12, 2007, Colombia's Faculty Action Committee issued a 'Statement of Concern' effectively disowning the views expressed by their President. It declared that Bollinger's address had 'sullied the reputation of the University with its strident [i.e., outspoken] tone' and 'abetted a climate in which incendiary [i.e., free and frank] speech prevails over debate.' It then made the extraordinary claim, for which there was no foundation whatsoever, that Bollinger's 'introductory remarks' had somehow 'allied the University with the Bush administration's war in Iraq' (against another Muslim tyrant) which, even if it had, was irrelevant. These and other similar scandals were indicators that in a strange twist of history there was developing not only on the campuses but in American society generally a new, inverse McCarthyism of the left, in which anyone who dared to resist the organised encroachments of Islam on America's free speech and secularism risked social and professional ostracism and even loss of employment, being denounced as a bigot and a racist and threatened with and even subjected to violence.

Even back in the 1990s, before the Sharia left-Jihadi alliance had got properly under way, openly anti-Semitic speakers were being invited to speak to US college audiences, though the predominant theme had at that stage little bearing on the Middle East, focusing instead on the Jews' alleged exploitation and oppression of blacks. So we had Khalid Abdul Muhammed, top aide to an avowed anti-Semite and Hitler admirer, Louis Farrakhan of the 'Black Muslim' Nation of Islam, declaiming to students at Kean College, New Jersey in 1994 that the Jews were 'sucking black blood daily'. As for the Holocaust, 'everybody talks about Hitler exterminating six million Jews. But they don't ask what they did to Hitler. They went in there, in Germany, the way they do everywhere they go, and they supplanted, they usurped.' Muhammed's hazy at best grasp of modern German history, not to speak of his rampant anti-Semitism, proved no hindrance to his then being invited to give a repeat performance to students at Howard University in Washington DC, known informally as the 'Black Harvard'. Setting the tone, in the course of introducing the main speaker, students union representative Malik Zulu Shabazz accused the Jews of murdering, amongst other black leaders, Martin Luther King, no doubt being unaware of King's outspoken Zionist sympathies. Muhammed's speech, another onslaught on the Jews, went down so well that he was invited to return two months later, pulling an audience of nearly 2,000. When four Jews silently protesting against the speaker's anti-Semitism had their posters torn from their hands and destroyed by Howard students, security officers refused to intervene, in fact one joined in the assault.

In the wake of this anti-Semitic frenzy, David Brian Davis, Sterling Professor of History at Yale University, was due to give a lecture in April 1994 on the Haitian black slave uprising of 1791, a subject one would have assumed would have been of special interest to Washington's 'Black Harvard' students. But it was not to be. At the last moment, Howard University officials cancelled the lecture. The problem was that being a Jew, Professor Davis *could not be guaranteed his physical safety*. Howard University was obviously not a 'safe space' for Jews. It has to be said that anti-Semitism has to this day continued to plague movements claiming to represent US blacks, in doing so aligning them on this issue with extreme white supremacists. Most notorious in this respect is the black separatist, or rather, self-segregationist 'Nation of Islam' led by Louis Farrakhan and, until his defection and then murder, by Malcolm X. Farrakhan on one occasion claimed the Jews 'control black intellectuals, they control black politicians, black preachers, black artists...they

control black life’, while a Nation of Islam preacher, Khalid Abdul Muhammed, described the Jews as ‘bloodsuckers of the poor’, ‘hooked-nosed, bagel-eating Johnny-come-lately perpetrating a fraud, just crawled out of the caves and hills of Europe, so-called damn Jew’.

More recently we have had the example of Black Lives Matter, which began in 2013 as a campaign against the shooting of blacks by (allegedly) trigger-happy, racist white police. Yet research into this question by amongst others, two black academics, showed that white police officers were 20% less likely to shoot unarmed black suspects than white ones. Furthermore, approximately 50 times as many blacks are killed annually by other blacks than armed ones by (mainly white) police officers. (See Appendix XI) However, their lives don’t seem to matter, any more than did the 800,000 Tutsis murdered by Hutus in Rwanda and the 400,000 Darfuris similarly hunted to their deaths by Janjaweed, the Sudanese Muslim militia, neither of which genocides of black Africans merited a single demonstration by the western protest industry. This indifference on the part of BLM to all but a very few violent black deaths was nothing short of an outrage, yet it was one that escaped condemnation by professional anti-racists. Take the year 2020, which saw massive protests across the USA and abroad against one black death, the illegal killing of George Floyd. In that same year, there was a total of 9,913 black victims of homicide. Of this number, 90% were killed by other blacks, without so much as a whisper of protest by BLM or the left. In the same year, the number of blacks killed by police was 241, the vast majority of whom were armed and involved in criminal activity, 3.7 % of those killed by other blacks. Yet this led, not to a call to blacks to stop killing each other, but to demands for the abolition of the police and the closing of prisons. In 2021, while the number of blacks killed by other blacks rose, the number of blacks killed by police fell to 139, reducing the share of blacks killed by police, some of them black, to less than 2%. Only their lives mattered to BLM, as for the rest, they did not give a damn, any more they did for the black Africans sold as of yore in the Muslim slave markets of Libya and Yemen. As they say, ‘wrong narrative’. (See Appendix XI for more details.)

Compounding this calculated indifference to the wrong kind of black lives, or rather deaths, under its leftist leadership, very rapidly, the campaign went racist, with in some cases successful demands for Jim Crow-style racially segregated dormitories and areas on college campuses, and on line, calls for the killing of all whites (the racist analogue of the sexist feminazi ‘kill all men’). As a movement very publicly endorsed and promoted by the Hitler-admiring Louis Farrakhan, it should have come as no surprise when it went anti-Semitic, with its claim that the US government, through its support for Israel, was ‘complicit in the genocide taking place against the Palestinian people’, as if this ‘genocide’ was already a proven fact and had something to do with white police shooting blacks in the USA. For good measure, the campaign announced that it was supporting the boycotting of Israel. Here again we had a case of Sharia leftist hijacking, in which a movement founded for one purpose is manipulated to serve another, in this instance as in so many others, anti-Zionism. Pro-Israel Jews were even denied membership of Black Lives Matter. St Louis Rabbi Susan Talve was told ‘you support Israel, therefore you cannot support us’, as ‘solidarity with Palestine’ had become a ‘central [sic!!!] tenet of the movement’, evidently no less, and one suspects for some, more important than ‘black lives’, for example, those of the thousands of black Africans being auctioned by Muslim traders in the slave markets of Libya.

At the University of California, campus anti-Semitism in the aftermath of the Gaza conflict of 2014 became so blatant and potentially violent that the university authorities felt compelled to investigate it, subsequently issuing a report which revealed that matters had gone beyond verbal Jew-baiting, and ‘included vandalism, targeting property associated with Jewish people or Judaism’, in addition to ‘challenges to the candidacy of Jewish students seeking representative positions within student government’ and a ‘political, social and intellectual dialogue that is anti-Semitic’. Here was an anti-Semitism no longer concealed, as it normally is, by the mask of anti-Zionism and a feigned concern for the Palestinians. The Jew-hatred on US campuses had reached such a pitch of intensity and aggression that even liberal-minded staff found themselves unable to make a stand against it. In the spring of 2016, William Blizek, Professor of Philosophy and Religion at the University of Nebraska invited the award-winning Israeli film-maker, Shimon Dotan, to screen his film, *The Settlers*, which documented the history and current state of a Jewish religious settlement on the West Bank. The showing was to be part of an international conference on religion and film, scheduled to be held at the university in March 2017. Alerted to the proposed screening, the anti-Zionist lobby once more went to action stations. On June 24, 2016, the convenor of the conference, Professor M. Gail Hamner of Syracuse University’s Department of Religion, emailed the following text to Shimon Dotan:

I know you have been in contact with my Omaha [i.e., Nebraska University] colleague, Bill Blizek, about screening the *Settlers* and serving as plenary speaker at a religion and film conference in Syracuse in March 2017. I am the convenor of that conference and I found Bill’s description of your work, and the reviews I read of it exiting. [These even included one in the Islamophile *New York Times*] I now am embarrassed to share [with you?] that my SU colleagues, on hearing about my attempts to secure your presentation, have warned me [sic] that the BDS [Boycott, Dis-investment and Sanctions] faction on campus will make matters very unpleasant for you and me if you come. [However banning the film apparently will not] In particular my film colleague in English who granted me affiliated faculty in the film and screen studies program and who supported my proposal to the Humanities Council for this project told me point blank that if I have not myself seen your film and cannot vouch for it to the Council, I will lose credibility with a number of film and Women/Gender studies colleagues’ [sic...the latter faculty, or more appropriately, coven, must have been the fief of ‘Third Wave’ Sharia feminists]. Sadly, I have not had the chance to see your film and can only vouch for it through my friends and through published reviews. Clearly, I am politically naïve. I feel tremendous shame in reneging on a half-offered invitation.

Asked by Dotan to explain her conduct, Hamner initially admitted that political pressure and career concerns were uppermost in her mind: ‘Obviously, my decision here has nothing [sic] to do with you or your work, and nothing to do with Bill, who contacted you in good faith. I feel caught in an ideological matrix [a euphemism for anti-Zionist intimidation] and my own egoic needs to sustain certain institutional affiliations.’ (That is, to keep my job.) Dotan contacted her again, far from satisfied with her failure to stand up to BDS censorship. This was her reply, which now offered a totally different explanation for her action. Her political naivety, the ‘ideological matrix’ and ‘egoic needs’ had all vanished, and were replaced by a *pro forma*-style justification that read as if it had been dictated at Jihadi gun-point:

As professor in the humanities, I respect, encourage and support [but do not practice] the academic freedom of all members of the academy, including Shimon Dotan. I want to be clear, however, [now we have reached the qualifying 'but'] that he was never invited by me, or anyone else affiliated with the University, to present his work at this semester. While we had considered adding him to an upcoming series, no one from the University ever extended an invitation to him. This is a case of poor communication [no, anti-Semitism] that has led to terrible misunderstandings. [there were no misunderstandings] I regret and apologise for the confusion [there was no confusion] this situation has caused.

The political climate of anti-Zionist (in its intent and consequences, more often than not, anti-Jewish) intimidation at many UK universities could be no different from that in the USA. Its origins date back to the mid-1970s when, with the war in Vietnam over, student radicals needed a new overseas cause to embrace. The auguries pointed to the Middle East. So, in April 1974, one year before the passing of the Soviet-sponsored UN resolution condemning Zionism as a 'form of racism and racial discrimination', the National Union of Students adopted a resolution which established the precedent for what later became known as the 'no platforming' of ideas deemed unfit for an airing on university campuses. Initially the ban applied to 'openly racist or fascist organisations' among which were listed 'the Monday Club [a right-wing Conservative Party pressure group of the time], NF [National Front, now the BNP], Action Party, Union Movement [Mosleyites], National Democratic Party.' To enforce the proposed ban, the resolution added that 'it is also necessary to prevent any member of these organisations or individuals known to express similar views from speaking in colleges by whatever means are necessary, including disrupting of the meeting.' Thus, 'direct action' 'from below'. Had it not occurred to those who supported this motion, amongst whom there surely must have been students of 20th century history, that these tactics were the very same as those that had been used by pre-war fascists to silence views they do not approve of?

Once the precedent had been established for no-platforming, Student Unions dominated by far leftists extended its scope to launch a co-ordinated attack on Jewish students who identified with Israel, on the basis that Zionism was no less racist (and for some, fascist) than the organisations originally debarred. At the following NUS annual conference, a motion appeared on the agenda demanding the expulsion of 'Zionist bodies affiliated to the NUS'. It was never debated, but it indicated which way the wind was blowing, because in October 1976, Salford University Students Union adopted a policy of restricting Zionist activity on campus. When in March 1977 the union staged a 'Palestine Week', it denied to the Jewish Society the right to hold an Israel Week and instead affirmed its existing policy that 'Zionism equals racism'. Soon campuses across the UK were following Salford's lead, with the Socialist Workers Party naturally leading the pack. In an article on the no-platforming of a Jewish (yes, Jewish) Society at York University, the party's *Socialist Worker* of June 25, 1977 explained the rationale for the action: 'It is because we oppose all racisms that we oppose an openly Zionist and racist Jewish society.' So, to use a Jewish inflection, banning a Jewish society is *anti-racist*? The campaign to drive Zionists off the campus gathered added momentum when the far left, again led by the SWP, allied itself with the increasing numbers of Muslims entering the UK's higher education system. Like several other universities, Kings College London operated

what is known as a 'safe space' policy administered by a paid 'safe space' officer, whose task, whatever his official job description might say, was to ensure that students' minds were protected from being disturbed by politically incorrect opinions. When the College's Jewish Society invited an Israeli speaker to address the Society, after initially banning the event in the interests, we must assume, of student 'safety', the 'safe space' officer relented, but on the condition that he would attend and supervise the event. This supervision, as it turned out, consisted of trying to prevent the guest speaker from addressing the meeting, abusing the President of the Jewish Society and denying admittance to Jewish members of the society, while allowing in Muslim anti-Zionists, who were then permitted to disrupt the proceedings without any adverse repercussions to themselves. This happened, not in Berlin in 1933, but at a London College in 2014. In January 2016, Kings was the scene of another organised bid to deny the College's Jews the right to free speech. A meeting of the College's Israel Society was terminated after an obviously pre-planned invasion by a gang of pro-Palestinian Muslim students, who broke chairs, smashed windows and set off fire alarms. The arrival of more than twenty police officers restored order but, despite the evidence of substantial criminal damage, they inexplicably made no arrests. This too happened, not in Berlin in 1933, but at a London College in 2016.

At Oxford, by repute the UK's premier university, the anti-Semitism prevailing in its Labour Club became so virulent that following the club's decision in 2016 to endorse the twelfth annual anti-Israeli 'Apartheid Week' sponsored by BDS, its Jewish Co-Chairman, Alex Chalmers, felt obliged to resign. Jew baiting had reached the point where:

- a Club member was disciplined by their college for organising a clique of students to chant 'filthy Zionist' whenever they saw a particular Jew;
- Jews were routinely referred to as 'Zios', a term first used by the Ku Klux Klan;
- the murder of Israeli Jewish civilians by Hamas was openly applauded;
- a club member argued on the Club's Facebook site that all Jews were legitimate targets for assassination;
- claims were made that belief in an international Jewish conspiracy was not proof of anti-Semitism;
- club members sang a song titled 'Rockets over Tel Aviv';
- a former Club Committee member proposed that all Jewish students at Oxford should be required to renounce support for the state of Israel and its policies. If they refused, no Club member should associate with them;
- club member and Corbynite Momentum activist James Elliot wrote in *Oxford Student* that 'anti-Semitism is an old accusation from Zionists, retreating behind mendacious slurs'.

All such complaints about anti-Semitism were routinely dismissed as 'Zionists crying wolf'.

These were just some of the views expressed and activities conducted by members, not as one might assume of the Oxford University Palestinian or Islamic Societies, but the gilded youth of its Labour Club. In 2010 it was the turn of Muslims to lay into the Jews when Danny Ayalon, the then Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister, was invited to speak at Oxford University Union. As on a similar occasion at Manchester University, on his arrival, his car was besieged by a Muslim mob and, according to his staff, 'several students attempted to physically assault the Deputy

Foreign Minister but were prevented from doing so by security'. His speech was constantly interrupted by heckling from members of the Palestinian Society. At one point, a student was heard and recorded calling out the Arabic words '*idhbah al-Yahud*', which translated, means, 'death to the Jews'. In a press release issued after the meeting, Ayalon described this as 'tantamount to a call for genocide'. The university's Palestinian Society also issued a statement after the meeting, describing their intervention as 'a massive success'. This happened, not in Berlin in 1933, but Oxford, England, in 2010.

Despite the incidents and statements listed above, an investigation in 2016 on behalf of the Labour Party's National Executive Committee headed by Baroness Royall concluded that there was 'no institutional anti-Semitism at the Oxford Labour Club', whatever that might mean, and there was 'no value [sic] in pursuing disciplinary cases against students who might[sic] be better advised as to their conduct'. There was rather 'a clear cultural problem [sic], which means that some Jews do not feel welcome'. Could this reference to a 'cultural problem' be a euphemism for Muslim anti-Semitism? Members of the public were clearly not intended to know, because the party's Corbynista NEC in its wisdom refused to release the evidence on which these conclusions were based, even rejecting a request by Baroness Royall to do so. The report was subsequently leaked to the *Jewish Chronicle*, which then published it on August 4. Even then, although Royall amassed 300 pages of evidence, her report of a mere 13 pages, much of it waffle and padding, cited none of it.

At the UK's other elite university, it was not anti-Semitism but Sharia Thought Policing, literally, that had moved up several notches when compared with other campuses, where generally its enforcement is regarded as the responsibility of student unions and university authorities. When, in February 2007, the Clare College Cambridge student magazine, *Claereification*, published an issue satirizing religion, it violated the campus *dhimmi* code by including among a number of faiths, two items on Islam; a spoof article titled *Ayatollah rethinks stance on 'misunderstood' Rushdie* and a reproduction of one of the Danish cartoons. Retribution was both swift and unprecedentedly vindictive. Not only did Clare College Fellows summon a Court of Discipline to try the offending editor, the only such session in living memory. The court *notified the police* that a possible crime had been committed under Section 5 of the Public Order Act of 1988 (pertaining to so-called 'hate speech'), to which the police responded by interviewing the editor. The court also sent a report to the Crown Prosecution Service to the same effect.

All this was done on the sole initiative of Claire College Fellows, who instead of seeing it as their duty to protect the freedom of expression of their charges, were hell-bent on securing a conviction for exercising it that could have resulted in a prison sentence of up to seven years. The no less *dhimmi Independent* reported that 'the College Chaplain has been involved in talks aimed at trying to ease racial [sic] tension and is known to have met members of the Islamic Society and a local Imam to discuss how to best quell fears over potential racial [sic] clashes.' Claire Senior Tutor Patricia Fara joined the fray, insisting, with scant respect for the meanings of words, that calling in the Thought and local Police was somehow consistent with Clare's being 'an open and inclusive college'. In the Newspeak lexicon, 'inclusive' has acquired the opposite meaning to that found in conventional dictionaries. It now means excluding ideas liable to stimulate controversy. If we are to believe Fara, the two items in question 'had caused widespread distress [sic!] throughout the Claire

community', the later evidently being one which, like its diaspora Muslim counterpart, in order to remain 'warm and tightly-knit', required the banning and even criminalisation of dissent from the prevailing official 'narrative' on matters Islamic. And so, two items in a student magazine about a religion had been transformed into a potential cause not only of 'racial tensions' but even campus 'racial clashes', though precisely between whom, the *Independent* was understandably at loss to say. What we can be sure is that the satirising of any other religion would not have evoked, and in this case, in fact did not evoke, remotely similar reactions. While Jewish students have found that campuses can be rather unsafe spaces where they are concerned, especially if they voice their support for Israel, when Muslim students wish to invite an anti-Semitic Jihadi speaker to address their society (which they should have every right to do), everything goes according to plan. For example, in 2010, the Kings College Islamic Society hosted Sheikh Abdullah Harkim Quick, who converted to Islam in 1970. He is on record as describing Jews and gays as 'filth'. Despite understandable but nevertheless misguided protests from Jewish students, the meeting went ahead as planned, since the college authorities insisted, correctly, on the speaker's right to free speech, a right that was not so easily accessible on the occasions when the speaker happened to be a Jew. We have good grounds to assume that the Islamic Society event proceeded without any supervision by the 'safe space officer', because just as at all other institutions of higher education, there is always a safe, indeed welcoming space for anti-Zionists at Kings College.

Just how easy it had become for small numbers of Muslim and Sharia left students to set the political agenda was demonstrated in March 2014 when, yet again at Kings College London, the Student Union, supposedly representative of a total student body of nearly 26,000, voted by 384, that is, less than 2% of the total, to 252, to affiliate to the anti-Israeli 'Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions' campaign. When the vote was carried, jubilant anti-Zionist students chanted 'from the river [Jordan] to the [Mediterranean] sea, Palestine will be free', providing proof, if any more were needed, that the intention was not to boycott Israel, but destroy it. So 'safe' was Kings College for Muslims that its 'prayer room' (why institutions of learning need rooms for the mumbling of mumbo jumbo is beyond me) although officially open to those of all faiths, in deference to the misogyny of Muslim male students, had its two entrances signposted, in accordance with Sharia law, as one for inferior women, the other for superior men.

Again as in the USA, UK campus anti-Semitism (for such it is, whatever it might call itself) can turn violent. In April 2010, as on a similar occasion at Oxford, Manchester police had to rescue Israel's Deputy Ambassador, Talya Lador Fresher, from an attempt by an anti-Zionist student mob to smash her car windows as she arrived to address a meeting at the city's university. Following the attack, Manchester's Police Chief Peter Fahy warned that Jews were more likely to be the target of attacks in Manchester than any other city in the UK, and promised to step up the police presence on campus to deter any more such incidents. The driving force behind this campus anti-Semitism was of course the University's Islamic Society, backed up by the Sharia left. Together they had colonised the Student's Union, transforming it, as on other campuses, into a vehicle for promoting Jihadi Islam and exercising a Sharia thought control over the student body. To these ends, the Students Union operated, even if by another name, the same 'safe space' policy as at Kings, imposing a ban on what it called 'extremist causes.'

While we can be sure, in the light of the assault on the Israeli Deputy Ambassador, that the ban did not apply to the enemies of Israel, no matter how violent, it most certainly did to its representatives. Over the years, the University Islamic Society had hosted Muslim speakers who made no secret of their anti-Semitism or the virtues of Jihadist movements such as the Taliban. These views were not of course classified as 'extreme', maybe because in the estimation of those that governed the affairs of the Student Union, they were not. The targeting of Jews and Israel at Manchester University dated back to at least 2002. In that year, prior to a vote by students on whether to boycott Israeli goods, the General Union of Palestinian Students distributed a leaflet containing re-cycled Neo-Nazi slanders against the Jews. Following the defeat of the proposal, a brick was hurled through the window of one Jewish student's residence, and 'Slaughter the Jews' daubed on the door of another. No action was taken against the General Union of Palestinian Students. But when, at the Students Union Freshers' event in June 2015, the Free Speech and Secular Society sought permission to display at its stall copies of the special post-massacre number of *Charlie Hebdo*, permission was of course denied...this was, after all, a university, where students' delicate minds needed to be protected from such disturbing images and thoughts. Across the UK no less than the USA, universities were becoming places where at all costs, students needed to feel safe and comfortable, unless of course they happened to a Jew. An official of the Manchester University students union explained how its safe space system operated: 'After being aware of the potential presence of the [*Charlie Hebdo*] images, we wanted to work closely with all groups involved to ensure they were comfortable [sic] with the final action. On balance, we took [from whom?] the call that the open presence of the magazine was not in the interests of the event or our members...' Evidently, as on other campuses around the UK and the USA, legally adult students were deemed incapable of deciding for themselves what was in their own best interests.

Just as was the case at Bath University (see below), a clique of Thought Police, responding to aggressive lobbying by Muslim students, decided what the rest of the student body, in this case numbering 40,000, could and couldn't see and read, and therefore, hopefully, not think. Justifying the ban on *Charlie Hebdo*, another union Thought Police Person claimed there was 'genuine concern that the presence [sic - not sight] of the magazine may cause distress and insult to others.' (hence the apt term, 'snow flake' students) Censorship evidently does not cause distress and insult to those who are censored, or to those who want to find out for themselves what the censored material actually said. Big Brother knew best. This is how the long arm of Islam's blasphemy laws reached into the heart of UK academic institutions, its path smoothed and guided by a campus thought police in cahoots with like-minded staff. In the name of making students feel 'safe' and 'comfortable', and protecting them from 'distress', laws devised by and for seventh century desert barbarians decided what could be said, read and seen in western, twenty first century places of learning. Islamic intimidation works. (Manchester University was also witness to a purge of two Jews from the editorial boards of two of its academic journals, simply on the grounds of their pro-Israel sympathies.)

In February 2013, Essex University authorities, rather than enforce order to protect free speech, chose instead to terminate a debate when anti-Zionist hooligans disrupted a speech by one of the participants, the new Israeli Deputy Ambassador, Alon Roth-Snir. When Professor Thomas Scotto attempted to re-invite an Israeli

spokesman, he was told by university authorities to 'let it go', in other words, to let anti-Semitic thugs exercise a veto over matters that were legally only the responsibility of the university's administration. This extraordinary capitulation to a mob rule that denied freedom of speech to Jews could perhaps be explained by the fact that like Kings and Manchester, Essex University operated a 'safe space' policy which forbade anything that, quote, 'cause[s] needless offence, concern [sic] or annoyance [sic] to others'. A Jew defending the state of Israel in a debate obviously fell into this category, hence the need and, it would also appear, the right to silence him by any means necessary.

Fuelled by the bigotry of what it is reasonable to assume were mainly Muslim students (and at least one member of staff) anti-Semitism erupted at Essex University in February 2019, when more than 200 students voted down a proposal to establish a Jewish Society at the university, where there already existed Muslim and Christian Societies. On this occasion, the university authorities acted firmly in defence of its Jewish students by overruling the decision. They also suspended a Muslim lecturer in computer science, Dr. Maaruf Ali, who had posted on-line denials of the Holocaust and a warning that 'the Zionists next [sic] want to create a society here at our [sic] university.' It is reasonable to assume that Dr Ali was one of the instigators of the adverse vote.

By contrast, up the road from Colchester, at Norwich University, Mexican students, if any indeed existed, found themselves being shielded from any insult to their ethnicity by a ban at a freshers' event on the wearing by non-Mexicans of sombreros being given away by a local Mexican restaurant. Justifying this lunacy, the students union explained that the 'discriminatory or stereotypical language or imagery aimed towards any group or individual based on characteristics will not be permitted as part of our advertising.' Even though there were no reports of any Mexican students (assuming that such existed) being traumatised by the sight of a non-Mexican student wearing a sombrero, students caught wearing one were ordered to remove it by the student union Hat Police. If enforced consistently, as surely it should be, the ban on this so-called 'cultural appropriation', in which those of Caucasian race avail themselves wrongly, albeit legally, of artefacts originating in other climes than their own, (the reverse of course does not apply) would result not only in the non-wearing and therefore non-purchasing of sombreros, but the bankrupting of the proprietors and unemployment for the staffs of 'ethnic' restaurants, food and clothing shops, impoverishment for the millions of non-westerners dependent for their livelihood on 'third world' tourism and the production of exports to the west and, somewhat perversely, increased trade for westerners offering substitute or alternative, domestically generated products and services. In the arts, the consequences of what would amount to a regime of cultural and racial segregation would be incalculable, an impoverishment of all humanity, no matter what colour its skin.

Consider just music, which for centuries, if not millennia, has been enriched by cross-fertilization.... for example, Puccini's *Madam Butterfly*, Bach's frequent use of French dances such as the *gavotte* and the *courante* and Copland's of Mexican (sic!) rhythms. There would be a blanket ban on the composition, performing and recording of works influenced by jazz, such as those of Ravel, Milhaud, Gershwin, Stravinsky, Shostakovich, Seiber, Satie, Walton, Copland and Bernstein. As in the days of Jim Crow, white musicians would no longer play in mixed race jazz ensembles. Again, everyone will be the loser. One thinks in this context of the

collaboration between the black Miles Davis and the white composer and arranger Gil Evans on the seminal album 'Sketches of Spain'...three-way cultural appropriation.

The enforcement of the left's version of cultural apartheid, already rampant in other forms on campuses across the USA, requires, so we are told, that the presumed gains of the underprivileged must be paid for by pains necessarily inflicted on those responsible for their plight. However, here we have pain or rather loss in plenty, but no gain to anyone, because, in the examples I have cited, and I could have provided many more, eradicating cultural appropriation also comes at a price for those who are intended to be its beneficiaries. But no matter. In the struggle against white supremacy, sacrifices must be made even if they are inflicted more on its victims than its perpetrators.

The descent into campus lunacy gathered pace when, emulating a practice already well-established at US colleges, in 2018, Manchester University Students Union (again) banned hand-clapping after 'snow flake' students complained they found the sound distressing. It peaked when the School of African and Oriental Studies Student Union required a comedian to give a signed undertaking that he would avoid the following topics as the condition of being allowed to perform at a student gig: Racism, sexism, classism (no jokes about greedy bankers) ageism, ableism, homophobia, biphobia, transphobia, xenophobia, Islamophobia, or anti-religion or anti-atheism (atheists are notorious for their thin skins). The comedian naturally refused to sign the Union's 'Behavioural Agreement Form', commenting, 'Students are being taught to prevent offence rather than to seek the truth and pursue experiences'.

On some campuses, the drive to silence dissenting opinion would not be out of place in a fascist, Stalinist or theocratic state. In 2014, sombrero-free Norwich University banned a speaker from UKIP, citing its policy of 'ensuring that UEA students are on a campus where they feel safe, secure and respected', protected in this case from the trauma-inducing opinion that the UK should leave the European Union, a policy, as it so happened, that was also supported by the Sharia left Socialist Workers Party, the Communist Party of Britain and a number of prominent leftists, including former professional student protestor and latterly media mogul Tariq Ali and, before he became Labour Party Leader, Labour MP and anti-Zionist campaigner Jeremy Corbyn.

In April 2015, Belfast Queens University was due to host an event titled 'Understanding Charlie: New perspectives on Contemporary Citizenship after *Charlie Hebdo*'. But once again, it was not to be. Fear of a Muslim backlash prompted Vice Chancellor Patrick Johnston to cancel the event on the grounds of the University's 'reputation' (sic) and 'security concerns'. Stephen Evans of the UK National Secular Society, which has almost single-handedly defended free speech in the face of opposition by religious zealots of whatever denomination, said that this was

another example of fear - real or imagined - shutting down debate, discussion and normal academic freedom. Patrick Johnston is just the latest to capitulate in the extraordinary climate that exists today. The answer to "security concerns" is not to cancel every event which might upset Islamists, but to provide security. Free speech must be defended, not hidden away in case it upsets someone.

Going on previous form, we can safely assume that were Queens to host an event critical in any way of Israel, there would be no issues of 'reputation' and 'security' requiring a cancellation, whatever Jews or anyone else supportive of Zionism might say about it. Increasingly, as such scandals as this prove, public debate about Islam and support for Israel was being effectively closed down by a combination of thought-crime laws, the enforcement of 'safe spaces', and threats and even the use of violence by the joint forces of organised Muslims and the Sharia left.

The campus anti-Israel offensive in the UK bore fruit in June 2015 when the Annual Conference of the National Union of Students voted to affiliate to the Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions campaign, while regimes and movements that support or wage war on Israel and deny academic freedoms to their own students were applauded. In the prevailing climate of moral nihilism engendered by a hatred of all things Israeli and for many, also Jewish, anything went. Older readers may well recall that there was a time in the heady 1960s when student radicals scorned all organised religion, at times going out of their way to display an *enfant terrible* contempt for its practitioners of whatever persuasion. Those days are long gone. The *dhimmi* student left became so deeply committed to the prevention of offence taking by Muslims that it was prepared to seek the assistance of infidel clergy should the need arise. In April 2015, a comedy production at Bath University had a scene removed after the student union's word police secured an endorsement of their action from the university's Christian chaplains, on the grounds that the scene 'mentioned' (not, it should be made clear, impersonated) Jesus and Mohammed. Shades of Bob Pitt's outrage at Jesus and Mo. And yes, there it is in the Ten Commandments: 'Take not the name of the Lord in vain'.

Over the decades, we have become accustomed to witnessing the synchronised protests of clerics of all denominations, Tory tabloids and more recently, a Leader of the Labour Party, when insufficient deference was accorded to ancient superstitions and those allegedly credited with their creation. Now they had been joined in this display of piety by the National Union of Students, which saw as one of its responsibilities the re-imposing on campus of the UK's repealed blasphemy laws, though not as before to protect one particular version of Christianity, but Islam. Who would have believed it? The affair certainly did have its comic aspects, as do certain other escapades of the Sharia left. But there were deadly serious issues at stake here too, those of the subversion of academic freedom and the imposition of thought control. In the case of the censorship of the Bath University drama production, unlike a time-tabled course lecture, which students would be have been under an academic, if not legal requirement to attend, no one would have been compelled to watch the scene in question. Any sensitive souls who did and then found the mere mention of the name of Jesus or Mohammed simply too much to bear would have been free to leave at any time and if necessary, to receive counselling. If there was an admission charge, they could also demand their money back. But no. The all-knowing censors and their clerical accomplices understood better than the students themselves what they should want to see and hear, and what they should not. Who said Stalinism was dead?

Justifying its 'redaction' of the production, a spokesperson for the students union explained that it was 'normal' practice' for it to vet and if necessary, censor all such scripts. 'Normal practice'? But this was England, not North Korea! And what was the point, let alone grounds, for censoring a comedy production that

simply 'mentioned' the name of Jesus when anyone, including Bath University students, could see on TV screens, on line or in cinemas the likes of the Vicar of Dibley, Father Ted, Dave Allen, Rev, Ballykissangel, the Life of Brian and The Meaning of Life? Could it really have been that the Canutes of Bath University Students Union were engaged in what was certain to be a doomed attempt to create in Bath an island of piety in the midst of a stormy ocean of menacing, mocking disbelief? Let Bath University Students Union Thought Police explain. Its aim, they said, was 'ensuring an inclusive [again], welcoming and friendly environment for the whole student community' and 'promoting fun [sic] and enjoyment', goals and ethos eminently suited to a Butlin's Holiday Camp or a toddlers' playgroup, but surely not an institution of higher learning.

In the light of the ban imposed on the student comedy production, the undeclared principle at work here seemed to be that since amongst a 'whole student community' numbering around 20,000, there were likely to found adherents of the entire spectrum of social, political, philosophical and religious viewpoints known to mankind, in order to preserve the university's 'inclusive, welcoming and friendly environment', ideas or opinions that might in any way be seen to threaten the blissful harmony of this 'student community', such as for example anything that smacked of a disrespectful attitude towards religion, had to be squashed before they saw the light of day. Far safer to have some 'fun' than risk experiencing mentally taxing and potentially divisive disputations about the meaning of life and the origins of the universe. But this is paternalistic nonsense. Students after all are legally, and one must assume, also intellectually, adults. Why then do they need this cossetting? Why should free debate, satire and controversy be seen as inimical to friendship? Cannot friends disagree and yet remain friends, and others agree and yet not be friends? And do students have to be friendly and fun loving?

'Friendship' is a possible by-product of a course of study at university, not its purpose. And we are not all made the same. Some will perhaps not want to be 'included', preferring instead their own company. It is even possible that some students, rather than seeking fun, will revere and pursue knowledge for its own sake. Why is it assumed that all students must want the same things, like one big happy family? It is surely possible to make everyone 'welcome', whatever that might mean, without imposing the absurd condition that in order to keep everything 'friendly' and 'inclusive', students might have to keep their opinions to themselves. What sort of a 'welcome' is this from an institution whose prime (some like myself would say sole) function should be to enhance the student's critical faculties, impart and encourage a love of knowledge, encounter new ideas, however disturbing, and promote debate and rational, independent thinking? The problem for university thought police is that these objectives unavoidably clash, as they always have done, with those of religion, which demands from its believers unquestioning faith in unprovable claims, thrives on credulity, ignorance and fear and is ever-ready to intimidate and silence all those who doubt or disbelieve.

The expansion of human knowledge, which once upon a time was understood to be the sole purpose of a university, not only requires that we should permit controversy. We should encourage it, not least because the free exchange and contesting of ideas is now and always has been the oxygen of human progress. Without freedom of thought and expression, without the right to differ, to argue, to challenge and yes, to offend and even outrage, our civilisation, since it is grounded, unlike the world of Islam, in freedom of thought and expression, will suffocate,

wither and die, just as did that of ancient Rome and Greece when they succumbed to Christian rule. Incredibly, here in Bath in the 21st century, (but not only in Bath, as we have seen), officials of a student union, in cahoots with clergymen and, presumably, with the agreement of the university's authorities, were imposing a regime of thought control that if enforced generally, would bring about just such an outcome.

As in the USA, so in the UK there is nothing more likely to cause panic on a university campus than the prospect of an address delivered by an ex-Muslim atheist woman, a spectacle calculated to reduce any full-blooded male Muslim to a state of abject self-pity and uncontrollable rage. It was to protect these very sensitivities of the Muslim student fraternity at Warwick University from collective trauma that in September 2015 the students union decided to withdraw its invitation to the leftist atheist Marynam Namazie of the Council of Ex-Muslims of Britain. The grounds for this decision bore an uncanny resemblance to those invoked by Cardiff Council when it closed down the Israeli football exhibition, by Brandeis University for the withdrawal of its award of an honorary degree to the ex-Muslim atheist and women's rights campaigner Hirsi Ali, and for the exclusion of Shimon Dotan from the Syracuse University film event: 'After researching both her and her organisation, a number of flags have been raised. We have a duty of care [again, the infantilising of adult students] to conduct a risk assessment for each speaker who wishes to come to campuses.' The only flag that was being raised was that of surrender to the campus Sharia Thought Police, hell-bent as always on silencing any serious debate about Islam.

What exactly was this 'risk' that required the exercise of a 'duty of care' on behalf of a student body that in age and, one hopes, also in mental capacities and resilience, was composed not of school children in *loco parentis*, but entirely of adults? We read on: 'There are a number of articles written both by the speaker and by others about the speaker [sic] that indicate that she is highly inflammatory and could incite hatred on campus. This is a contravention of our external speaker policy.' De-coded, for 'inflammatory' read 'not to everyone's liking' and for 'hatred', read 'disagreement with certain religious beliefs and practises, namely those of Islam.' It was indeed true that Marynam Namazie would have said things about Islam that could have caused Muslim students, especially male Muslim students, to hate her and quite possibly, want to kill her, as is the way in the realm of Allah. In such an eventuality, the only 'duty of care' that would have been called for was to ensure that the speaker was able to exercise her right to be heard, and that any such hatred was contained within civilised boundaries, admittedly no easy task when the speaker was an outspoken ex-Muslim women and the audience included male Muslims who, if in Iran, Saudi Arabia and what were then Taliban controlled regions of Pakistan and Afghanistan, could easily have been enthusiastic spectators and even rock-throwing participants at her public execution as an apostate.

It is not hard to reconstruct the chain of events that led to the cancellation of the invitation. Just as was the case at Princeton, Howard, Colombia, Brandeis, Belfast, Bath, Manchester, the LSE, Kings, Essex, and a growing list of other academic institutions, once the impending event was publicised, the Sharia Thought Police swung into action. First, the University Islamic Society demanded, in the name of preventing 'hate speech', that the invitation be cancelled. This was rich, coming from those whose holy book refers to Jews as 'apes and swine', and women as being by their nature subordinate to men. The student union, ever ready to

demonstrate its commitment to combating a phantom Islamophobia, duly obliged, announcing that after 'researching both her and her organisation', it now realised, yet again late in the day, that the 'inflammatory' speaker posed a potential threat to the tranquillity of the campus and the well-being of its student body, to which it had, and I quote, a 'duty of care', for all the world like social workers have towards clients who are deemed incapable of looking after themselves. However, on this occasion, the ban was reversed after a concerted campaign led by two prominent (atheist) scientists, Professors Brian Cox and Richard Dawkins, proving that the campus Thought Police and Islamic intimidation can be challenged and defeated.

The gutsy Marynam Namazie's next port of call was Goldsmith's College, London, where hooligans from the College's Islamic Society, who throughout her address hurled abuse at her and chanted 'safe space' (sic), nevertheless failed in their attempt to prevent her from making her views known to those who had come to listen and debate. Prior to the event, hosted by the College's Atheist, Secularist and Humanist Society, and titled 'Apostasy, Blasphemy and Free Expression in the time of ISIS', the Islamic Society had, as elsewhere in similar situations, demanded the cancelation of the meeting. The reason given was that allowing her to speak would violate the college's 'Safe Space' policy, because she was 'renowned for being Islamophobic and very controversial'. What...again? Controversy at a university?

There is nothing out of the ordinary in a call for a ban on an ex-Muslim woman speaker by misogynist Muslim males. After all, it is what anyone versed in the ways of Islam would expect. What those unfamiliar with the ways of the Sharia left would find extraordinary, however, is that it was endorsed by the college's Feminist Society, which proudly declared that it 'stood in solidarity with Goldsmiths Islamic Society' (whose male members, remember, had tried to shout down a woman speaker) because 'hosting known Islamophobes at our University creates a climate of hatred.' The 'Islamophobe' in question was known internationally for her outspoken and, given her apostasy from Islam, courageous exposure of the oppression of women by and under Islam. The only hatred on display at the meeting was that of Muslim men unable to cope with the probably unique experience of an ex-Muslim women explaining why she rejected the subjugation of her sex by the Islamic faith. It was this that the college's *dhimmi* feminists found 'Islamophobic'. The meeting had a no less extraordinary sequel. The speaker posted on-line a video of the proceedings, showing the disruption staged by moronic hooligans of the College's Islamic Society, which included not only heckling but the playing of mobile phones. Instead of condemning their attempt to prevent the exercise of free speech by an invited speaker, the student union demanded that she remove the video 'as a matter of urgency' because the Muslim students caught in the act of disruption had found it 'distressing'. Poor Muslim men ...always the victim.

Next we have the case of Professor Steven Greer, an internationally renowned human rights scholar. He was left fearing for his life following accusations of 'Islamophobia' initiated by Bristol University Islamic Society. They arose from a human rights module in which he had made reference to the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre and Islam's death penalty for blasphemy. Although Professor Greer was exonerated after a five month [!!!] inquiry, the university, obviously in deference to his accusers, cancelled the module. Death threats followed, causing him months of sickness, leading eventually to his resignation.

Branded by the SWP (aka Sharia Wahhabi Party) as 'western pawns' for their armed resistance to ISIS, the Kurds, as we have seen, are second only to the Jews on the Sharia left's hate list. So it came as no surprise when, in November 2015, the Muslim-dominated student union at University College London vetoed a meeting by the College's Kurdish Society that was to have been addressed by an ex-student back from fighting with the Kurdish forces against the Islamic State. Justifying the ban, union official Asad Khan explained that 'in every conflict there are two sides, and at UCLU we want to avoid taking sides in conflicts.' Yet again, we see the same stifling of debate and controversy. No-one was asking the union to 'take sides', but merely to allow students to hear the case for the Kurds and then take sides if they so wished. I have no doubt that if the College's Islamic Society had invited a Jew-killing Jihadi from Hamas or a Yazidi-raping warrior from the Islamic State, the meeting would have gone ahead as planned. Some sides can be more equal than others. The UCL students union thought police not only sought to shield its charges from mental harm, but physical, banning the College's Nietzsche Society because it threatened 'the safety [sic!] of the UCL student body'. Sticks and stones may break your bones, but atheist philosophy can actually kill you! How art the mighty fallen. UCL was founded in 1826 by the free-thinking Utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham, the campaigner against slavery and the death penalty, the law reformer, advocate of women's equality, animal rights and the legalisation of homosexuality, precisely in order to provide a secular alternative, open to all, to the clerical chloroform then being administered to exclusively Anglican students at Oxbridge and Kings.

And how times change. Back in the heady red sixties, students were often portrayed as a bunch of longhaired, layabout trouble-makers, rebelling over nothing at great public expense, 'rentamob', as one journalist dubbed them. Today, the image, truer to life, is one of an abject, mind-numbing pseudo-radical conformism, a herd, Orwellian 'groupthink'. Supplementing 'safe spacism' is another highly effective device used by student leftists to silence dissenting voices, that of the 'no-platform' tactic, as enforced in the examples cited above. In the days of student radicalism in the 60s and 70s, it was reserved only for those considered to be on the extreme right, the slogan being 'no free speech for fascists'. No longer. In the last decade or so, ever greater numbers of opinions have been decreed unfit for student and more general consumption, beginning of course with anything that smacked of Zionism but also more recently extending to the non-or insufficiently Sharia left. Victims of this ever-expanding regime of thought control have been the veteran human rights campaigner Peter Tatchell, de-platformed for his 'racism' and 'transphobism', and for speaking out in defence of free speech on university campuses, and Nick Lowles, who heads 'Hope not Hate', an organisation that combats racism, fascism and 'Islamophobia'. But this last not in the approved manner, it would seem, because Lowles found himself no-platformed on account of his own Islamophobia, which consisted of his support for the Kurds ('western pawns' remember) in their resistance to the Islamic State, and campaigning against Jihadi 'grooming' of young Muslims.

The tactic of 'no-platforming' is not confined to student union activists. Academic staff who should be telling their charges to grow up and learn to argue against rather than silence or hide themselves from ideas they disagree with, have instead themselves lent their support to the policy of no-platforms. In February 2016, no fewer than 18 academics at Warwick University signed a joint statement

of protest against the visit to the university of an Israeli Embassy spokesman to take part in an International Relations Society debate titled 'Question Time: Israel and Palestine'. The academic quislings who signed the protest evidently wanted a debate in which one of the main participants would be excluded:

While debates in general [sic] are indispensable for rationally and logically debunking the other side's propaganda and exposing their defence of indefensible violations of international law, debating Israeli officials, including their spokespeople, does more harm than good to the struggle for Palestinian rights.

This is lunacy. Surely, if Israel's case is, as they assert, 'indefensible' why not seize the opportunity provided by the event to 'debunk' it? What possible harm can that do to 'the struggle for Palestinian rights'? If they are right, it should be no contest, with eighteen academics 'rationally and logically debunking' one Zionist Jew. What kind of example was this to students who should be learning how to debate, argue, reason and think for themselves? Instead, they were being mollycoddled mentally, infantilised emotionally, and trained to become intellectual wimps, encouraging them to believe that a case could be won by silencing or boycotting an opponent rather than by marshalling evidence and using logical argument. It came then as a welcome surprise when in December 2017, the Minister of Higher Education proposed to impose fines on universities that 'no platformed' outside speakers. National Student Union officials were outraged. 'We are not censoring free speech' protested one, 'we are protecting groups of students who have as much right to be there as any other student from groups that want to harm us physically [sic!!!] and mentally because of their identity.' And we have seen how this works, with male Muslim students demanding to be protected from the physical as well as mental harm that could be inflicted on them by an ex-Muslim feminist denouncing Islamic misogyny.

The systematic silencing of doubt and dissent was first instituted by the Roman Catholic Church's Inquisition, and emulated, on a vaster and far more effective scale, by modern totalitarianism, the principle being, what is right is determined by might. Now it is back, a cancer eating away at the heart of the very same institutions where, long ago, the battle was fought and won against clerical control of the mind. What is infecting our places of learning is a monumental *trahison des clercs*, and not just *academe*, but all society will have to pay the price, because safe-spacing and non-platforming are becoming so all-pervading that they have encroached upon areas that once would have been totally immune to this obsession with silencing dissenting views. The terror of being indicted as Islamophobic contributed to the world-famous biologist and secularist campaigner Richard Dawkins being no-platformed, or more precisely, 'disinvited', when in January 2016, the organisers of the New York North East Conference on Science and Scepticism (yes, this is not a misprint) cancelled their invitation to Dawkins to address the event because he retweeted a video comparing the intolerance of modern feminism with that of 'Islamists'.

Dawkins had his point proved for him when feminists successfully demanded that his invitation be cancelled. As always on these occasions, in a statement justifying the ban on Dawkins, the organisers of the conference of course made it clear that they 'believed strongly [no less] in freedom of speech and freedom to express unpopular views.' Then came the inevitable First Amendment-challenging

qualification: ‘However, unnecessary [sic] divisive, counterproductive [sic] and even hateful speech runs contrary to our mission.’ Who decides what is ‘unnecessary’? And hasn’t every advance in human knowledge been necessarily ‘divisive’, pitting those few sceptics who rejected the prevailing orthodoxies of their time against the many who were wrong? Galileo against the Church, Darwin against Genesis? As for ‘Hate speech’, all Dawkins had done was to re-tweet a quite funny critique of certain attitudes shared by some Muslims and feminists. The statement nowhere claimed that these attitudes do not exist, because its authors surely knew they did. Dawkins’ sin was to refuse to pretend they did not. And this from scientists and sceptics! Dawkins again ran afoul of the Thought Police when, in April 2021, he was retrospectively stripped by the American Humanist Association of their Humanist of the Year Award for the year 1996. (This too is not a misprint. I am convinced like other belated conversions by the US intelligentsia to a token and spurious anti-racism, its tardiness [25 years] was due to the Association’s concern not to be seen to be out of step with the post-Floyd surge of support for Black Lives Matter. See Appendix B.) Again, the reason given was a politically incorrect tweet, this time his own. It was structured as an exam question, and ran thus: ‘In 2015, Rachel Dolezal, a white chapter President of NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] was vilified for identifying as black. Some men choose to identify as women. You will be vilified if you deny they are literally what they identify as. Discuss.’ Yes, ‘discuss’. Evidently, even to debate, not necessarily to endorse, the belief that men cannot become women (a view universally shared, as it happens, by the discipline in which Dawkins has excelled) is now off limits for those identifying themselves, again, at the very least, questionably, as ‘humanists. This was also the considered opinion of Labour Leader Keir Starmer. (See Appendix XI)

Gender segregation, the Muslim version of apartheid imposed by Islamic Societies which accuse Israel of racial apartheid, naturally has the approval of Sharia left-dominated students unions, an example of this misogynistic practice occurring at the London School of Economics Islamic Society Gala Dinner, held in March 2016. Even the sale of tickets was segregated, with tickets for men and woman being sold separately. for ‘brothers’ and ‘sisters’. Inside the dining hall, male and female students sat apart and were rendered invisible to each other by a seven-foot-high rape-proof screen, ensuring that Sharia law ruled inside one of the UK’s most prestigious educational institutions. Alan Smithers Director of the Centre of Education and Employment Research at Buckingham University, was none too happy with the proceedings: ‘The point of a university is to engage in a wide variety of experiences, and it is surprising that the university should let a segregated event of this kind go forward.’ As had been the case on other campuses, the LSE student union however had no problem with gender segregation. Its Secretary, Nona Buckley-Irvine, who explained she attended the event because ‘I support our faith societies’, found it ‘a relaxed evening’ with ‘absolutely no tensions’, ‘one of the best I’ve been to’. As for the segregation, despite the seven-foot screen, somehow, ‘men and women were talking throughout’. Proving what? An LSE spokesman said ‘the School is raising this issue with the Society and the Student Union’. This episode was one more refutation of the received wisdom that the more educated Muslims become, the more likely they will want and be able to integrate. Why should they, when our academic institutions are only too willing to ‘go Sharia’ when the need arises?

Overwhelming evidence has accumulated on campuses all over the UK and the USA, in institutions where above all others, there should be total intellectual freedom, of the imposition of a mind-numbing group think censorship, one that not only exploits the political correctness of university authorities and the sympathies of teaching staff, but as we have seen, is also backed up by the threat and use of mob violence. Anyone familiar with the history of the Third Reich will recognise at once the similarity of the tactics being employed by the Muslim-Shari Left Axis in US and UK universities against supporters of Israel, and the anti-Semitic hooliganism of Nazi students in the last years of the Weimar Republic. As in the US and the UK, so in early 1930s Germany, the leading bodies of students unions and fraternities were captured and used as launching pads to intimidate into silence (here too with the connivance of university authorities) Jewish and left-wing students and academics. Offending professors would have their lectures either boycotted or disrupted, before being hounded out of their jobs once the Nazis came to power, while heavily outnumbered Jewish students were physically attacked. Well before the Nazi take-over in January 1933, Germany's seats of learning were not 'safe spaces' for the Jews, just as they have not been on certain campuses both in the USA and the UK.

Adding an extra impetus and financially underpinning to the Islamisation of campus life is the massive funding by Arab states, in the first place naturally by Saudi Arabia, of leading western institutions of learning, a policy that is clearly designed to subvert their academic integrity and independence in matters concerning Islam and the Middle East, since a large proportion of the funding goes towards the establishment of Islamic studies centres. Twelve Arab states have donated £75 million to create an Islamic Studies Centre at Oxford, while the Saudis have donated £1 million to the university's Middle East Centre. Sheikh Sultan bin Mohammed al Qassimi of Sharjah has donated £5 million to Exeter's Islamic Studies Centre, and the Sultan of Oman £3.1 million for a chair in Arabic at Cambridge. And so the list could go on. In the USA, Arab money has been poured into Ivy league universities on an even grander scale: Yale Law School, \$10 million, for the study of an oxymoronic 'Islamic Law and Civilisation'; Georgetown, a Catholic University, \$40 million from a single Saudi prince, while Harvard received \$30 million in 2005 alone. Again, the list goes on. It would be the height of naivety to assume that this largess is for the altruistic purpose of furthering enlightenment as to the ways of Islam. He who pays the piper will call the tune, and the tune is a familiar one. In March 2016, across the USA, 150 universities held their annual Israel Apartheid Week, in many cases with the endorsement of college authorities. This orgy of Jew-baiting became a regular feature of the campus calendar, as it did in the UK.

In the UK, the two decades of combined Muslim/Sharia left campaigning for the de-Zionisation of campus life and politics was climaxed in April 2016 by the election of the anti-Semitic Jihadi Muslim Malia Bouattia as President of the National Union of Students. Her credentials for the post were impeccable. She had been to the fore in blocking as Islamophobic the motion at the 2014 NUS convention condemning ISIS atrocities. She was also on record as claiming that Jews control the media, and that her former university at Birmingham was a 'Zionist outpost'. She had also advocated armed struggle against the state of Israel. Her election triggered demands in student unions across the UK for withdrawal from the NUS, though given the prevailing anti-Zionist climate on UK campuses, not to

speak of the left in general, there was little prospect of their succeeding, judging by what occurred when in 2017, the NUS issued a questionnaire to students concerning their religious affiliations. (To think there was once a time when the Left regarded religion as a private affair.) Eleven options were listed, with one missing... yes, Judaism. Six months later, after complaints and apologies, another one was issued. Again, without Judaism. Considering how high must have been the mathematical odds against the same religion being excluded twice in succession by mere chance, to believe this was simply a mistake, as an NUS official claimed, is to strain the limits of credulity to beyond breaking point. By wielding Ockham's razor, one arrives at an entirely convincing explanation. To loosely paraphrase Lady Bracknell, once arouses suspicion, twice is proof. Given the track record of the NUS, need I say of what?

When graduates, many barely literate, emerge with their often-worthless degrees from this cocooned, politically correct, controversy-free environment, those most amenable to the currently prevailing ethos of thought control will begin to climb the ladder that leads towards positions of influence and even authority in society. Displaying the special kind of arrogance that feeds on a profound ignorance of the realities of the world, they will then be qualified and only too willing to impose on others the drab, shallow, conformist, pseudo-radicalism that they uncritically imbibed in their student years for lack of exposure to anything different, disturbing, 'offensive', annoying, difficult, distressing and intellectually challenging...in all respects, ideal sharia fodder. The result are manifold, but I conclude this chapter with just one, the most tragic. Among the factors contributing to the abysmal failure of various care agencies to protect non-Muslim girls from the predations of Muslim rape and pimping gangs was that their staff, especially at the decision-making upper levels, had been reared in this mind-numbing university culture of political correctness which, rightly if belatedly, was identified by official reports on the Rotherham Muslim rape scandal as a major factor in facilitating the unhindered, organised sexual exploitation by Muslim men of thousands of young girls over a period of three decades and more. (See Chapter 27)

Addenda

The UK's largest teaching union, the far-left dominated National Education Union (previously the National Union of Teachers), like its junior political partner, the National Union of Students, has, shall we say, an unorthodox way of combatting anti-Jewish prejudice. Its idea of a training session on anti-Semitism, held in June 2021, was, with one exception - and even that served its purpose - to feature speakers that echoed the union's implacable hostility to Israel. The event was organised by a close friend of Corbyn, the Polish anti-Zionist campaigner Ewa Jasiewicz, who first made her mark, literally, when she scrawled anti-Israeli graffiti on one of the preserved walls of the Warsaw ghetto, where in the spring of 1943, its Jews staged their uprising against the Nazis. She also called for a terrorist attack on the Israeli Knesset while it was in session. Two of the course leaders were Jewish members of the tiny anti-Zionist group appropriately (and deliberately) called 'Jewdas', one of its tweets saying that Israel was a 'steaming pile of sewage that needs to be disposed of.' A videoed speech by the late Chief Rabbi, Lord Sacks, was used as proof that pro-Zionist Jews were 'right wing'. All the written materials

re-enforced the same message...that anti-Zionism had nothing to do with anti-Semitism, and that all Zionists were political reactionaries.

As we have seen, Richard Dawkins pursuit and defence of scientific truth made him enemies on the woke left. The March 8, 2023 *Newsletter* of his Foundation for Reason and Science would have won him no favours either, where it raised the alarm of a 'science beset by would-be censors operating under the banner of "inclusion"'. It cited examples similar to those I cite in this work. In New Zealand, science students must be taught that 'Māori "ways of knowing" share equal standing with so called "western science".' Woke US and Canadian academics have demanded the elimination of 'potentially harmful terms used in ecology and evolutionary biology.' The list includes 'male and female' and 'blind/doubleblind' because, says Dawkins, 'the term implies ableism, of course.' What have we come to, that in the third decade of the 21st century, a scientist felt obliged to defend his calling, and risk his reputation for doing so, by saying something that once would not have needed saying: 'The true reason why science is more than an origin myth is that it stands on evidence; massively documented evidence, double blind trials, peer review, quantitative predictions precisely verified in labs around the world.'

It would be quite wrong to leave readers with the impression that even though it began and has caused the greatest harm there, the pro-Islam offensive is confined to academic institutions. Let me cite an item from the Summer 2023 bulletin of the National Secular Society, the only organisation that come what may, is prepared to expose and combat the privileges and pernicious impact of organised religion in the UK:

'During last year's football World Cup in Qatar, many organisations, including ourselves, drew attention to the human rights abuses perpetrated by Qatar's Islamic regime. But one [Boston] councillor's decision to join the criticism cost him his mayoralty. As Boston's longest serving councillor, Mike Gilbert was due to be elected mayor in May [2023]. But other councillors blocked his mayoralty after accusing him of 'hate speech' for comments he made on Facebook during the World Cup. His posts raised concerns about aspects of Islamic doctrine which criminalise homosexuality and severely restrict the rights of women'

20 Underneath the Arches

An example of the Sharia-infested leftism that has emerged since 9/11 was on view at the November 2014 annual conference of the newly-founded Left Unity Party, the result of a merger of various small leftist groups opposed to the SWP, its most prominent member being the obsessively anti-Zionist 'socialist realist' film director and long-time WRP associate Ken Loach. With the emergence of Corbyn as a Labour leadership contender, Loach defected from Left Unity and returned to the Labour Party, which he had left in the mid-1990s to join fellow anti-Zionist Zealot George Galloway's Islam-oriented Respect. He then endorsed Corbyn's bid for the Labour leadership and directed his televised broadcast for the 2017 general election. Like his old WRP fellow traveller comrade Ken Livingstone, an exponent of leftist Holocaust revisionism, Loach took the opportunity to air his views on the subject at the Labour Party conference of September 2017, where the party's anti-Semitism reached a new level of venom, with demands that the Jewish Labour Movement should be expelled from the Labour Party. a measure that Corbyn and Livingstone had first proposed as far back as the mid-1980s. Loach, for whom a mythical Israeli Holocaust of the Palestinians was a proven fact, having added his name to Corbyn's as a signatory to the Cairo Declaration accusing Israel of 'genocidal crimes' against the Palestinians, proposed at a fringe meeting that whether the Holocaust of the Jews even happened was a fit subject to be debated in the Labour Party. As if, despite the mountain of evidence, it was still an open question, Loach told a BBC reporter 'history is there for all of us to discuss'. And why just the Holocaust? Why not 9/11, 7/7, the Illuminati? The US moon landings? Disgusted with the Jew-baiting, Brighton's Labour Mayor pledged that until Labour cleaned up its act, he would not be having them back.

At Loach's Left Unity conference, a proposal, moved in the form amendment to the conference's main policy statement on the Middle East, ventured into the outer reaches of Sharia leftist lunacy. It called for support for the Islamic State, which was depicted, quote, 'despite the atrocities and attacks on the Kurds', as a 'stabilising force' in the region. The mover, a certain John Tummon, who, along with Loach and many of a like orientation, were soon to join the Labour Party during the Corbyn intake, argued that there was a sound historic precedent for such a policy: 'There was nothing wrong with Stalin providing an overarching stability to Eastern Europe.' Then of course there was Hitler's. But staying with Stalin's, we still have slave camps, the deportation of entire nations, the bleeding white of Eastern Europe's economies and plundering of its natural resources, the ordering of all human activity in accordance with the whims of a paranoid despot.

Certainly, likening the two totalitarian systems, one secular, the other theocratic, was well-grounded, since both depended on the application of unbridled terror. But there is also a difference, and an important one. Like its Nazi analogue, the final sanction of Stalin's regime was earth-bound, death at the hands of its political police, the NKVD, its writ therefore running no further than a torture chamber, slave camp and an unmarked grave. The terrestrial terror of Islam is re-enforced by an unquestioning belief in the wrath of an all-seeing Allah, a totally genuine fear of the punishments that the *Koran* warns await the infidel and apostate beyond death in hell, and which therefore evokes a substantially greater readiness to conform in the

hearts and minds of the faithful. Islam also differs from secular totalitarianism in that its rules and laws, codified by the *Koran*, thousands of *Hadith* and *Fatwas*, aim to extend its 'overarching stability' into regions not attempted or even envisaged by a Stalin, Hitler or Mussolini. Neither the notion nor the reality of a civil society, least of all one advocated by Marx, where the 'free development of each is the condition for the free development of all', can co-exist for one moment with a faith that demands total and permanent submission to the will and laws of a celestial despot. This is because Islamic theocracy claims and indeed, when given the opportunity, enforces the right to 'micro-manage' every aspect, detail and waking moment of human behaviour, even to the extent of 'private' body functions such as flatulence, defecation, urination and sexual intercourse. There are also, would you believe, rules governing paedophilia, bestiality and yes, necrophilia. (See Appendix G)

In his commentary on the *Hadith* of Sahih Muslim concerning these exotic practices, in number 525, Imam Al-Nawawi says the following: 'If the penile head has penetrated a woman's anus, or a man's anus, or an animal's vagina or anus [sic], then it is necessary to wash whether the one being penetrated is alive or dead [sic!].' Here we have a rule that caters for necrophilial bestial sodomy. But if a randy Muslim man is alone in the middle of the desert with nothing but a camel for company, anything might happen. Perhaps surprisingly, women are here also allowed to have their bit of kinky fun too: 'If a woman inserts an animal's penis, she must wash, and if she inserts a detached penis [sic! - a Sharia dildo -] there are two opinions, the most correct is that she must wash.' And who am I, a mere *kuffar*, to say otherwise? The *Book of Purity*, (sic) in its *Chapter of Washing* (from the *Igur Hadith*) elaborates on Sahih Muslim as regards bestiality: 'If the male genitalia completely entered a woman's anus, or a man's anus, or an animal's anus [sic] or vagina, he must be washed whether it was alive or dead [sic], young or old.'

Sahih Muslim and *Igur* are Sunni *Hadith* collections. The leading modern Shi'a authority, Ayatollah Khomeini, had his own take on Islamic sexual etiquette. In the 1990 edition of his work on the subject, *Tahirolvasyleh*, we read the following: 'A man can have sexual pleasure from a child as young as a baby. However, he should not penetrate her vaginally, but sodomising the child is quite acceptable.' To Allah, it goes without saying, and also, obviously, to the sodomist. But to the child? Khomeini continues: 'A man can have sex with animals such as sheep, cows, camels [a sight to behold, surely] and so on. However, he must kill the animal after he has his orgasm. He should not sell the meat to the people of his own village but selling the meat to a neighbouring village is reasonable.' And so it is. Though forbidden by Islam, and often punished with death, it seems that sodomy within the family is exempt, and indeed has its own special rules: 'If a man sodomises the son, brother or father of his wife after their marriage, the marriage remains valid.' That's a relief.

The often-murderous antagonism between Shi'as and Sunnis is notorious, but in matters sexual, as we can see, there is a striking convergence, even when it comes to the practice of 'thighing'. In his justly famed *Green Book*, the spiritual leader of Iran's 'Islamic Revolution' had this to say on the subject: 'It is not illegal for an adult male to "thigh" or enjoy a young girl who is still in the age of weaning, meaning to place his joystick [sic] between her thighs and to kiss her.' As can be gathered from these examples, in the world of Islam, nothing is left to chance or human caprice. There are rules for everything one can imagine and even for things most of us cannot. Whether it can be achieved or not, the intended result is a world-wide

society of pious, submissive zombies, the *Ummah*, resembling an ant hill or beehive, in which from birth each individual is crushed, stifled, programmed, monitored and absorbed into the dumb, grovelling servile herd of the faithful, by a combination of brain washing, terror, and promises of rewards in paradise. All will chant the same hate-filled slogans, mumble the same prayers, perform the same pointless rituals, and believe in the same Dark Age nonsense, much of replete with homicidal implications. Men will be dressed in a white pyjama-style tunic and sport untrimmed beards (but shave their pubic hair). Women will only be allowed to leave their homes when accompanied by an adult male relative and rendered virtually invisible by being covered from head to toe with a black shroud in case they are raped by a Muslim man who, unlike the prophet, cannot control his penis. This then is the joyless theocratic dystopia that Islam has in mind for the entire human race, forever. Its clerical rulers will demand exactly what 'Islam' means...submission, symbolised and ritualised by prostration at prayer, a total unthinking, unquestioning, slavish subordination to the will of a non-existent Allah, as conveyed in his 'recitation', the *Koran*, to his last and greatest prophet, Mohammed. Its message, reduced to its essentials, as with its parent monotheisms is, 'obey me in all things...or else.

I realise that my depiction of Islam is not shared, at least publicly, by what one might call 'official circles'. But it is by those who have lived under and rejected it, for example Ayaan Hirsi Ali and, as here, another apostate atheist who, to avoid the unwanted attentions of the Religion of Peace and Tolerance, writes under the name Ibn Warraq:

Islam is a totalitarian ideology that aims to control the religious, social and political life of mankind in all its aspects; the life of its followers without qualification; and the life of those who follow the so-called tolerated religions [Christianity and Judaism] to a degree that prevents their activities from getting in the way of Islam in any way. And I mean Islam. I do not accept some spurious distinction between Islam and 'Islamic fundamentalism' or 'Islamic terrorism' [to which we can add "Islamism"]. The terrorists who planted bombs in Madrid; those responsible for the deaths of more than two thousand people on September 11, 2001, in New York and Washington DC; and the ayatollahs of Iran were and are all acting canonically; their actions reflect the teachings of Islam, whether found in the *Koran*, in the acts and sayings of the Prophet, or Islamic law based upon them. Islamic law, the Sharia, is the total collection of theoretical laws that apply in an ideal Muslim community, one that has surrendered to the will of God. It is based, according to Muslims, on divine authority that must be accepted without criticism, without doubts and questions. It is an all-embracing system of duties to God, and it controls the entire life of the believer and the Islamic community. Islamic law intrudes into every nook and cranny of the life of an individual, who is not free to think for himself.

Readers, many perhaps unacquainted with the complexities, not to say comprehensiveness, of Islamic law, might find this depiction of a future world ruled by it exaggerated, even possibly Islamophobic. True, it is to be feared, but the fear is not irrational, which is what the word Islamophobia means (not hostility towards Muslims). In the already cited Islamic law manual, *The Reliance of the Traveller*, its 1,200 pages lay down thousands of rules that regulate every possible human action that could occur within a society governed by Islamic principles. As they are readily available in a number of on-line translations, this claim can easily be

verified. So here two examples must suffice. Section E, titled 'Purification', has a subsection numbered 9, with the heading, 'Going to the Lavatory'. This in turn is divided into six sub-subsections, two of which, 1 and 5, are divided yet again into sub sub sub-sections, number 1 with no fewer than 16, and 5, with 4. While these rules have nothing to say about the safe disposal of human waste, the prospective excretor is confronted with a battery of regulations that, if followed strictly to the letter, would demand the skills of a gymnast, an astronomer and a geographer. First off, he or she has to enter the lavatory with the left foot first, and leave leading with the right, though why this is so, we are not told. But, easy enough. Now comes the tricky part. Whilst maintaining the regulation squatting position, the excretor must balance on the right foot and, in all probability without the aid of a map, compass or sextant, ensure that he or she does not 'relieve oneself with one's front or rear facing the sun, moon or the sacred precincts in Jerusalem.'

Allah also has rules for farting, in Arabic, *hadath*, on no account to be confused with *Hadith*, which means the sayings and deeds ascribed to the prophet. These rules come into play during the time a Muslim is at prayer. The regulation posture to be assumed during prostration necessarily brings the thighs into contact with the stomach, thus applying pressure to the bowel region. The result can be the unintended evacuation of air through the anus, especially in the case of Muslim men with larger than normal guts. In the event of wind being thus expelled, the following rule applies. 'Allah's Apostle said, "the prayer of a person who does *hadath* is not accepted until he performs *wudu* [ablution].' (Bukhari, Volume 1, Book 4, Number 137) However, as is often the case, things are not so straightforward as might seem from this rule. It transpires there are farts and farts, as we learn from a supplementary *Hadith* on the same subject: 'My uncle asked Allah's Apostle about a person who imagined to have passed wind during the prayer. Allah's Apostle replied, "He should not leave his prayers unless he hears sounds or smells something"'. (Bukhari; 1, 4, 139). But this does not exhaust (no pun intended) the subject. It could well be that a Muslim at prayer could be tricked into wrongly assuming he had farted, and thus into needlessly repeating his *wudu* before starting his prayers all over again: 'Satan may come to one of you in *salah* [prayer] and blow air in his [the praying Muslim's] bottom, making him imagine he has lost his *wudu*. So, when one experiences that, he should not turn away unless he hears a sound or smells an odour.' (Narrated by Bazzar as in *Bulugh al-Maram*). Why Satan is not capable of generating farts that smell and emit sound is left unexplained here, though perhaps the answer is in the *Koran*, Chapter 4, Verse 76: 'Feeble indeed is the cunning of Satan.' With examples such as these (and there are thousands more such rules of equal complexity and obscure purpose) it is easy to see why the intrusiveness and effectiveness of Islamic rule requires for its codification, interpretation and enforcement a supervising and of course privileged elite...the Muslim clergy.

With these considerations in mind, let us return from the anal contortions of Islam to the mental ones of the Sharia left over what to say about the Islamic State. The amendment at the Left unity conference to back the ISIS theocracy was rejected, but the fact it was moved at all indicated the degree to which the most extreme Islamophilia had penetrated (no *double entendre* intended) the ranks of the far left. In effect, its movers were saying, ignore the rapes, beheadings, crucifixions, burnings and burials alive, massacres of Kurds, Yazidis, Shi'a Muslims and Christians; a terrorist Islamic theocracy will bring 'stability'...a strange

stance for supposed revolutionaries to adopt towards a regime that is anything but left wing, and which could be said of any dictatorship, no matter what its political complexion. Indeed, this very argument was used by western exponents of 'realpolitik' in support of the seventh century vintage Taliban theocracy in Afghanistan, while some on the left still wax nostalgically (though never having experienced its benefits themselves) on the 'stability' once enjoyed under Saddam Hussein's fascist regime just as on the Spanish far right, after the Franco's death in 1975, many yearned for a return to the social discipline imposed by his Christian version of clerical fascism.

Differences undoubtedly exist on the far left, even if only ones of tactics, as to how far this alignment with Islam should be taken. A genuinely 'tiny minority' even opposes it entirely. For the rest, what predominates is the search for a new political arena and audience, one that involves not only collaborating with ultra-reactionary Muslim organisations in the West, but support for equally reactionary Islamic movements and despotisms in Asia and Africa, in the case of the SWP, not excluding even the Islamic State, the Taliban, Al Shabaab and Boko Haram. And it is indeed perhaps the greatest irony of all, that the far left's alliance with Islam has ranged it on the side of regimes that, in some cases for decades, have mercilessly hunted down, tortured and murdered the cadres of secular movements in general and leftist ones in particular, as in Iran under the Ayatollahs, Indonesia under Suharto, in Iraq the genocidal fascism of Saddam, and Libya under Gaddafi.

One of the most nauseous instances of the left-Islam alliance was that of leftist reactions to the attempted assassination by the Taliban of Pakistan girls' education campaigner and Nobel Peace Prize laureate Malala Yousafzai. Some leftist publications just chose to ignore her attempted murder. Others went further. Her open membership of a Trotskyist group, itself a stand of great courage in a country teeming with regime-tolerated honour killers and Taliban Jihadis, did not protect her from the vilest of accusations by western leftists, one going so far as to claim that the attempted murder never took place, that 'the "brave Malala story" was a complete fake', which presumably included the operation carried out on her head injuries by Birmingham brain surgeons. The ways of the imperialists are devious indeed.

And there was also precious little sisterly solidarity on offer when the US journalist Lara Logan was stripped naked, gang raped and abused as a Jew (which she was not) when covering a Cairo demonstration during the so-called 'Arab Spring' of 2011. Social media comments, some obviously motivated by the customary political correctness, alleged that there had been no gang rape, but at worst, a 'sexual assault', presumably of the kind inflicted by Muslim migrants on hundreds if not thousands of women across Europe on New Year's Eve of 2015. One blogger claimed she had 'made the whole thing up' while another suggested that Logan's own naivety concerning Islam's treatment of women was to blame, because in her account of the gang rape, she recalled being 'so often told by Muslim men and women that women were more valued than in the west'. Naivety, even in a journalist, is not a crime. But gang rape, is, at least in a western country, even if, as in the UK until recently, not treated as such when the gang rapists are Muslims. One US 'feminist', writing in the UK *Guardian* (but of course) was evidently more concerned to counter criticism of Muslim misogyny than demonstrate her solidarity with sister Logan. She argued that what she called 'street harassment' (sic) was a 'world-wide phenomenon that crossed cultural and

religious boundaries', ignoring the huge difference between a western woman being pestered on a bus or train in her home town, however unpleasant or demeaning the experience might be, and being stripped naked and gang raped as a Jewish woman thousands of miles from home in an Islamic country. She also made the claim that 'up to [sic] 100% of American women suffer street harassment as well'. 'As well'? Logan was not 'harassed', she was surrounded, Cologne fashion, by a mob of at least 200 young men, then stripped and gang raped. And what does 'up to 100%' mean exactly? Up to 100% could mean any number from 0 to 100. So much for sisterly sympathy and solidarity. Instead of fabricating fantasies about 100% harassments, why didn't she come out and say it, that being gang raped by the Muslim patriarchy is a wonderful cure for white privilege, so why didn't Lara lay back and think of Mecca?

21 Orient

Integral to Marx's view of history, first codified in his *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, was that the rise and then global dominance of capitalism was the indispensable pre-condition for the creation of a classless and stateless society. As he put it in a later work, 'new relations of production never replace old ones before the materials conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.' It was consequently the task of the bourgeoisie, not the working class, to create a truly modern world, by making 'barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.' In his final, and uncompleted work, *Das Kapital*, he returned to the same idea:

'It is one of the civilising aspects of capital that it enforces [i.e., extracts] surplus labour in a manner and under conditions which are more advantageous to the development of the productive forces, social relations and the creation of elements for a new and higher form than under the preceding forms of slavery, serfdom etc.'

This proposition was embraced by all those regarding themselves as 'orthodox' Marxists, but rejected by non-Marxist Russian populists, who saw the seeds of an imminent socialist order in the common land ownership of the pre-capitalist village *mir*. Prior to the revolution of 1917, Lenin's Bolsheviks, like nearly all other Marxists, insisted that in accordance with Marx's schema, a quasi-Asiatic Russia had to become properly capitalist, that is to say, industrialised, westernised and democratic, before it could become communist, to become a country where, as the *Manifesto* has it, the proletariat constituted the 'immense majority' of the population not, as in the Russia of 1917, and even more so in the countries of the Orient, a tiny minority surrounded by a massive, primitive peasant majority.

Just how little Russia on the eve of the Bolshevik seizure of power conformed to Marx's desiderata is shown by the following: less than 10% of Russia's population lived in urban areas, compared with the UK's 73%, and Germany's 60%, while Russia's per capita national income was 12% of that of the USA. Barely a third of its population were literate, compared with Germany's virtual 100%. Each of Russia's indices were those of a backwardness so chronic as to render impossible any prospects of the socialism Marx and Engels had in mind in the *Communist Manifesto*, where they insisted that 'united action of the leading civilised countries at least [sic] is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat'. Not one, chronically backward, eastern country, but 'at least' several advanced western ones. With Russia, according to these criteria, lacking the economic and cultural necessities for such a momentous and what is more, unprecedented undertaking, it was inevitable that when attempted, it proved a calamitously dystopian venture. Yet little if anything in the writings and policies of the Bolshevik leaders prior to 1917 so much as hinted at such an outcome.

One of the strategic issues that separated the Bolshevik Lenin from the Menshevik Georgi Plekhanov in the years before 1917 was the peasant question. Lenin advocated nationalizing the land as a means of winning the support of

Russia's vast peasant majority, but Plekhanov feared that this would 'leave untouched this survival of an old semi-Asiatic order', thereby facilitating its restoration. 'We want no Chinese system,' said Plekhanov. And such did occur, though not under a restored autocracy, as Plekhanov feared, but the truly Oriental despotism of Stalin. Yet despite their disagreements on the peasant question, Plekhanov and Lenin were equally concerned to ensure that Russia took the path of democracy after the overthrow of the autocracy, Lenin by gaining the support of the peasantry, Plekhanov by avoiding policies that could lead to a despotic, centralized state that commanded all Russia's economic resources. Indeed, up to the very eve of the overthrow of the Romanov dynasty in March 1917, Lenin vehemently insisted that as revolutionary socialists, the Bolsheviks should be at the forefront of the struggle for democracy and freedom. Only after the Bolshevik seizure of power in November 1917 did he claim that democracy was no more than a necessary prelude to a socialist revolution that once achieved, could be dispensed with (so-called 'bourgeois democracy'), but rather the reverse, that a socialist revolution was the necessary means to achieve full democracy:

Basing ourselves on the democracy already achieved, and exposing its incompleteness under capitalism, we demand the overthrow of capitalism, the expropriation of the bourgeoisie as a necessary basis for the direct, *complete* and *all-round* institution of *all* democratic reforms. (All emphases are Lenin's)

Lenin wrote this in October 1915. In September 1916, in an article titled *A Caricature of Marxism* directed, as the title suggests, against a departure from this policy, he was no less vehement in his insistence that 'socialism is impossible [sic] without democracy'. Here indeed he stood on solid 'orthodox' ground...did not the *Communist Manifesto* aver that to emancipate itself, the working class must first 'win the battle of democracy', thus bringing about the rule of the 'immense majority', and also Marx, in an earlier work, only discovered and published after Lenin's death, that the goal of communism was the creation of a 'human democracy'? Lenin's historic and, for the cause of socialism, tragic *volte face*, occurred on his return to Russia from Swiss exile in April 1917. Sensing, as it proved correctly, that the Bolsheviks, although lacking a majority, could seize power and then rule Russia on their own, Lenin, to the initial confusion and even consternation of his still 'orthodox comrades', at once began to sing a very different tune, the consequences of which I discuss in my *Seeds of Evil*. It suffices our purposes to record here that by the time of Lenin's death in January 1924, by first closing down a Constituent Assembly in which the Bolsheviks had less than a quarter of its delegates, then outlawing all other parties, and finally opposition within his own, he had bequeathed to his successor, Stalin, a Russia fast regressing (as he himself acknowledged in his last writings, and as Plekhanov had feared) to its Oriental past, one ruled with 'Asiatic' methods, those of the *Cheka*, by an ever-shrinking circle of aspiring and warring despots. The final result was exactly as Lenin, citing as his model, Peter the Great, had decreed to be necessary for the Bolshevik rule of a primitive, semi-barbaric Asiatic Russia...a 'dictatorship' that was 'based directly [sic] on force and unrestricted by any [sic] laws', methods not only analgous to but also culturally inherited from what Marx described as Russia's 'Tartar yoke'.

After 1917, 'orthodox' Marxism endured, if only briefly, in the policies proposed by the much-abused and then persecuted and finally outlawed Mensheviks, with their insistence that Russia was, as Marx had insisted more than once, in every respect far too backward for experiments in full-blooded socialism. In rejecting the orthodoxy of the Mensheviks, the Bolshevik coup of November 1917 was, officially at least, predicated on what proved to be the false assumption that its example would trigger similar revolutions in the most advanced capitalist states, whose fraternal communist governments would then provide the economic and technical aid Russia needed to overcome its chronic backwardness.

Back in 1905, Trotsky had warned what the consequences would be if such revolutions were not forthcoming: 'Without the direct state support of the European proletariat the working class of Russia cannot remain in power...of this there cannot be any doubt.' When these hopes inevitably faded, a disillusioned Lenin turned his back on what he now called 'the counter-revolutionary West' and faced towards what he saw as 'the revolutionary East', an orientation that like his domestic regime, had to await its consummation in the era of Stalin, with peasant-based revolutions in China, North Korea and Indo-China. That these regimes are the only ones that have endured, and Russia's partially so, while those installed by Stalin at end of the Second World War in eastern and central Europe were swept away by popular revolts in 1989 and replaced by governments that took the path of liberal democracy, is one aspect and proof of the great cultural divide that as in the time of Marx, still pits the East against the West, the other, related to it, being Islam.

Like all western socialists of his day, Marx believed that the threat to civilisation, and therefore to the prospects for socialism, came from the East and, unlike his epigones of today, made no bones about saying so: 'Europe has one of two choices, either an Asiatic barbarism led by the Muscovites will descend upon us like an avalanche, or it must restore Poland, and in this way, separate itself from Asia.' (Today, again unlike his epigones, we can be sure Marx would say, not 'restore Poland', but 'defend Ukraine'.) Since their own survival, let alone continued progress, was at stake, Germany and France had to be prepared to 'wage the war of the West against the East, of civilisation against barbarism', to 'fight the barbarian hordes [sic – 'hate speech']. And while the French and the Germans held the line against Russian despotism, the task of the English lay further afield again, uprooting the ancient foundations of Russia's parent Orientalism, one which, for all its 'idyllic village communities, inoffensive though they may appear', had 'quietly witnessed' the 'perpetuation of unspeakable cruelties'. (See Appendix XIV) So Marx posed the question, one that pertains to the world of Islam no less than the modern imperial ambitions of Russia and China, and retains all its force today: 'Can mankind fulfil its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia?' If the answer was, as Marx believed, no, then given the inertness of the East, such a revolution would have to be imposed from the outside, by what the Left today calls 'Western imperialism'. As the world's leading colonial power, England had a special responsibility in this respect, namely, 'to fulfil a double mission in India: one destructive the other regenerating - the annihilation [sic] of old Asiatic society and the laying the material foundations of Western society in Asia.' (Marx's first mentor, Hegel, arrived at precisely this conclusion some three decades previously in his *Philosophy of History*, that 'the necessary fate of Asiatic empires' was to be 'subjected to Europeans'.)

As Marx saw it, the alternatives facing India and the East generally were either western, and this meant principally English, conquest and rule and their ensuing transformation, or the continued existence of, and I repeat, its 'village communities' which, 'inoffensive as they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism'. Only their incorporation, forcible or otherwise, into the bourgeois world (what today is called 'globalisation', detested equally by far left and right) would make possible the eradication of a form of society that 'restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and energies.' He could be describing the contemporary world of Islam...or Putin's Russia. So, the question was 'not whether the English had a right to conquer India but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by the Briton.'

Yes, this is Marx, not Clive of India. And Marx, together with his life-long comrade and co-thinker Engels, were in this respect very far from ploughing a lonely 'western imperialist' furrow on the left. The organisation which they helped to found in 1864, the International Workingmen's Association (later known as the First International), approved a resolution drafted by Marx denouncing the oppression of Poland by Russia, 'the dark Asiatic .[n.b.] power in the background as a last resource against the rising tide of working-class ascendancy'. As far as Marx was concerned, culturally, Russia was not in any sense a European nation, but the western outpost of Oriental despotism, implanted by the Mongol hordes of Genghis Khan and his successors, and from which its modes of thought and action it had thus far never been able to tear itself free. Marx explains why: 'It is in the terrible and abject school of Mongolian slavery that Muscovy was nursed and grew up...Even when emancipated [from the Mongols] Muscovy continued to perform its traditional part of the slave as well as the master', the enduring truth of which one can see on YouTube interviews with Russians who in one breath, applaud the invasion of Ukraine, and in the next, proudly proclaim their slave-like devotion to Tsar Vladimir Putin. (See Appendix XIV)

From its beginnings in the 15th century, the Russian autocracy adopted methods of rule it had learned from its Mongol predecessors and which it deploys to this day, both against its own people and those it invades and conquers. Again, I cite Marx: 'Every people appears to have grown in stature when it shakes off a foreign yoke.' But not the Russians: 'From Ivan's hands, Muscovy emerged still more debased', as it was to remain under two yokes of more recent times, those of Stalin and Putin. Following his expulsion of Tartar rule from European Russia, Ivan the Fourth, the first true 'Tsar of all the Russias', also called, with good reason, the Terrible, in 1564 partially re-Orientalised his kingdom by seizing vast tracks of land from the nobility, many of whom he suspected of treasonous plottings. Ivan's enormously expanded crown estates, the *Oprichnina*, and the ensuring Stalin-style purges of the land's previous owners, the Boyars, created on Russian soil a society resembling in its essential features those of the Orient...a despotic monarchy, the emasculation if not total elimination of a propertied ruling class, a vast 'public sector' economy, a captive labour force, and an autocratic state that provided Peter the Great in the early 18th century with the means to implement, again like Stalin (and more recently the homelands of Islam) with imported western technology and expertise, his grandiose but only partially successful programme of modernisation. Just as Ivan was Stalin's favourite tsar for his ruthless

suppression of all opposition, so Peter, (with his thirteen torture chambers) was Lenin's, who, without any sense of embarrassment, avowed that he would emulate and even surpass Russia's most illustrious Tsar in 'not shrinking from adopting dictatorial methods', 'like Peter', 'not hesitat[ing] to use barbarous methods in fighting barbarism.' With Ivan (Stalin's explicit model), and his black-coated *Oprichniki* as the forerunner of the Soviet secret police, and Peter, who built his new capital with an army of conscripted serfs, as Bolshevik exemplars, it is no mystery why, although its heartlands were located in Europe, Marx described Russia as 'the dark Asiatic power' and, for as long as it remained such, insisted that the watchword of the West had to remain, 'death to the Mongol [sic] rule over modern society'. And let us again be clear. By 'modern society' Marx had in mind exclusively European *bourgeois* society. How ironic then (and no less absurd) that with the advent and rise to total power of Bolshevism, the movement which, under the Asiatic despotism of Stalin, served as the instrument for consummating Russia's orientalist regression, became for many leftists throughout the western world, the model and exemplar of a radical, emancipatory party.

The (entirely predictable) failure of the Russian revolution to evoke similar overturns in the liberal democratic heartlands of western capitalism, followed by Lenin's advocacy of reliance on a 'revolutionary East' to defeat a 'counter-revolutionary West', necessarily led to a radical revision of the strategy and path for human progress advanced by Marx and Engels, one that was anticipated even before the Bolshevik seizure of power in November 1917. Addressing the sixth party congress in the August of that year, Stalin tentatively suggested that 'the possibility is not excluded that Russia will lay the road to socialism...We must discard the antiquated idea [that of Marx and Engels] that only Europe can show us the way.' Thus was born Bolshevism's 'Eastern Orientation'. In little more than a decade, Russia would regress from what Lenin described after the overthrow of the Tsarist regime in March in 1917 as the 'freest country in the world' to under his leadership a one-party state and a one-faction party to under Stalin, a truly 'dark' Oriental despotism.

Bolshevik global strategy underwent a no less radical and related transformation. Early in 1923, with hopes having faded of communist revolutions in the west, in one of his last published writings, Lenin not only gave Stalin's cautious proposition of 1917 his endorsement, arguing, *contra* Marx, that Russia possessed 'all [sic] that was necessary and sufficient' to 'build a complete [sic] socialist society'. He now went much further, in the same direction: 'In the last analysis, the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact Russia, India, China etc., account for the overwhelming population of the globe', an anticipation of Mao's 'The East wind will prevail over the West wind', and the village over the city. The inversion of Marx's historical schema and political strategy was now total. The route to global communism lay through the mud tracks, villages, farms and paddy fields of the pre-capitalist Orient, what later became known as the Third World, not the First World railways, cities, mills, factories and mines of the capitalist West. (The radical nature and disastrous consequences of Lenin's departures from the 'Marxism of Marx' are the subject of my *Seeds of Evil*)

Already by 1920, the first tentative and exploratory steps had been taken in pursuit of this new strategy, with the convening in the September of that year in Baku, the capital of Muslim Azerbaijan, of a 'Congress of Toilers of the East' (One delegate actually used the phrase 'Eastern orientation') Gathered there were its

organisers, leaders of the recently formed and Soviet-dominated Communist International, together with for the most part nominal communists from the Soviet East and nationalists from the Muslim world, in total around 1,800. In his opening address, Comintern President Grigori Zinoviev set the tone when, anticipating Lenin, he made the highly un-Marxist assertion that the 'peoples of the East', comprising as they did 'the majority of the peoples of the world', were 'alone [sic] in a position finally to settle the dispute between labour and capital'. He predicted that the 'real [sic] revolution will flare up when we are joined by the 800 million people who live in Asia', even though no such 'dispute' as yet existed in the East save in non-Muslim China, where an embryonic workers movement was stirring in its major cities. And yet China was represented by only one delegate at the Congress. In calling for a 'holy [sic] war against the British and French capitalists', Zinoviev provided a clue as to whom would be the real target of the proposed *Jihad*; not a virtually non-existent oriental, native bourgeoisie, but colonialist France and Britain, who had been lending military support to the Bolshevik's enemies in the Russian civil war. Already, Russian state interests were visibly impacting on the strategy and policies of the newly-formed International.

With the congress overwhelmingly dominated by Muslim delegations, Zinoviev's 'holy war' against the West required that Islam be treated, as it is by the Left today, with kid gloves, as one speaker explained:

Everyone knows that the East is utterly different from the West, that its ideas are different - and so a rigid application of the ideas of communism will meet with resistance there. Accordingly, if we want the four hundred million in the Muslim world to join the Soviet power, we need to apply a special yardstick in their case...Muslims will not abandon the Soviet power, but this is on condition that the peculiarities [sic] of the Eastern peoples be recognised.'

One of these 'peculiarities' was, and remains, Islam's teachings on the status and, consequently, treatment of women. A Turkish delegate, one of only two women to address the congress, put her male communist delegates and today's *dhimmi* feminists, with Lindsey German's 'shibboleths', Laurie Penny's 'horror stories' and Professor Briggs' 'personhood', to shame. Spurning Bolshevik multiculturalism and sensitivity training, she defiantly insisted that

...if the women who form half of every community are opposed to the men and do not have the same rights as they have, it is obviously impossible for society to progress: the backwardness of Eastern societies is irrefutable proof of this...The women communists of the East have an even harder battle [than the men] because, in addition [to the fight against the imperialists] they have to fight against the despotism [sic] of their menfolk. If you, men of the East, now as in the past, continue to be indifferent to the fate of women, you can be sure that our country will perish.

She then listed a series of demands that showed no respect whatsoever for Muslim 'peculiarities' and which, in each case, are as remote from realisation in the Islamic world today as they were when advocated in Baku a century ago, whereas, in Lenin's 'counter-revolutionary West', they are the legal norm:

1. Complete equality of rights;
2. Equal access with men to education and vocational training;

- 3: Abolition of polygamy. Equal rights with men in in marriage;
- 4: Equal access with men to employment and administrative institutions.

To the end of his life, Trotsky, a westernised, indeed cosmopolitan, assimilated Jewish internationalist *par excellence*, as an 'orthodox' Marxist, remained convinced, unlike Lenin and Stalin, that Russia (let alone the 'Orient') was 'too backward and uncivilised [sic] a country to be able to build a communist society by itself'. And he said this, not in 1917, but in 1938, after Stalin's first Two Five Year Plans had begun the transformation of the Soviet Union, at horrendous human cost, into an industrialised country, one equipped with imported western technology, but nevertheless resembling in all other essentials an Oriental despotism of the classic type described by Marx. The final judgement as to who was right in this matter was made in 1991, with the ignominious implosion of the state created by Lenin and enslaved by Stalin. (China's post-Mao adoption of a barracks capitalism that replaced Marx's 'barracks communism' (see Chapter 23) was a tacit admission of a comparable failure.)

With Stalin's elimination by 1927 of the internationalist Left Opposition headed by four Jews, Trotsky, Radek, Zinoviev and Kamenev (all destined to die at Stalin's hand, together with the rest of Lenin's closest comrades bar none) the Lenin-Stalin proposition became official party policy, known as 'socialism in one country'. One of the more exotic fruits of this 'Eastern Orientation' was a statement issued in 1925 in the name of the Surrealist movement led by André Breton. Intended as a first tentative approach to the French Communist Party, it embraced with the customary zeal of converts and an infantile *épater la bourgeoisie* the new orthodoxy on the iniquities of the West: 'Wherever Western civilisation is dominant, all human contact has disappeared except contact from which money can be made. It is the turn of the Mongols [sic] to bivouac in our squares. We should never for a moment worry that this violence should take us by surprise or get out of hand. As far we are concerned, it could never be enough'.

Now I arrive at my destination. Support for a war to the death by the East against the West, one waged, not by 'Mongols', (though some, along with huge numbers of other conscripts from the Russian far east, did serve as cannon fodder in Putin's war against Ukraine) but by a 'dark Asian' Russian despotism and a no less dark oriental Islam, has now become, following in the footsteps of the path charted by Lenin and followed by Stalin and Mao, has become the new leftist orthodoxy. As we have seen, and will see again, it proclaims, *a la* Lenin and Chomsky, that the 'main', indeed, the only real enemy, the 'West', is 'at home'- NATO, the EU, Washington...and Jerusalem. It is a sobering thought that the Leninist epigones who dominate the far left and, under Corbyn, exerted a substantial influence on the leadership of the Labour Party and a number of trade unions (on a wall of Unite's former Corbynista General Secretary Len McCluskey's office was hung a portrait of Lenin), collectively and quite openly support the 'revolutionary East' against the 'counter-revolutionary West'. It make little or difference whether this 'revolutionary East' be post Mao-China, Putin's Russia or Jihadi Islam, or, in its most extreme manifestations, ISIS and its offshoots, indiscriminate terror against civilian targets such as 9/11 and (Jewish) Israelis, and the Russian carpet bombing of civilian targets in Syria. All are blows struck against the 'enemy at home',

Beginning in 2001, in the aftermath of 9/11, with the launching of the Leninoid Stop War the Coalition, and culminating in the election of Corbyn as Labour Leader in 2015, the far left was able to exert an influence on the policies and leading circles of the Labour movement that had been beyond its reach over the previous half century and more. For obvious reason, the prime focus had been on matters of foreign policy, where the default position under Corbyn was explicitly pro-Russian, anti-Zionist and in not a few cases, as we shall see, anti-Semitic. Bearing in mind that this left was composed partly of tendencies, cliques and individuals who had either belonged to or had been closely associated with the residual fragments of the movement founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938, the Fourth International, it is ironic that their mentor should have been no more beguiled by the lure of the East than were Marx and Engels in their day. Trotsky's comments on Russian history are replete with references to its 'Asiatic barbarism', 'Asiatic patriarchy' (not *sis* white) and 'Asiatic cruelty', each being aspects of an inherited 'Asiatic culture which has contrived to remain static despite continual jolts from war and mutiny', a society trapped in a cycle of 'hopeless rotations', as the Arab and Islamic world still is today.

Yet despite its stagnation, for centuries Asia's Mongol-Turkic reach extended deep into what is today culturally as well as geographically Europe, beyond Russia as far west as Poland, the Baltic states and the Balkans, Romania and Hungary, as far south as Greece and Cyprus (where it remains), and ethnically as far north as Finland and the Laplanders of Sweden and Norway. As an enduring relic of this conquest, the Sami, Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian languages are not related to the Indo-European family but to the Ugric, originating from far east of the Urals. And how many Russians know that Kremlin is the Tartar word for fortress? Even Russia's two revolutions in 1917 failed to shake off what Trotsky revealingly described, like Marx, as its 'Tartar Yoke', within a little more than decade succumbing to the rule of what one of Stalin's Bolshevik victims, Bukharin, called 'an Asian despot, a tyrant,' a 'Genghis Khan'. Another, Comintern chief Grigory Zinoviev, having combined with Stalin to oust Trotsky only to then find himself on the receiving end of a similar manoeuvre, too late realised that he had been deceived by a 'bloodthirsty Ossetian [sic] who doesn't know what conscience is'. Rosa Luxemburg, although born in Russian-ruled Poland, spent her entire adult life in Germany, where her intellectual brilliance rapidly established her as one of the leading theoreticians of the German Social Democratic Party. From that highly cultured vantage point, she detected even in the early, 'orthodox' Bolshevism of Lenin an incipient totalitarianism, a 'Tartar-Mongolian [sic] savagery' that brooked no opposition:

A dozen outstanding heads do the leading and an elite of the working class is invited from time to time to meetings, where they are to applaud the speeches of the leaders, and to approve resolutions unanimously.

It could be Stalin's Russia, but what she was describing was the instrument that created it, the party of Lenin. George Plekhanov, the pioneer of Russian Marxism, had, through bitter experience, come to the same conclusions regarding Lenin's authoritarian ways and, what is most significant, like her, looked to the East for an analogy:

Since a [party] congress is in the offing, the central committee ‘liquidates’ [sic] the elements with which it is dissatisfied, everywhere seats its own creatures and, filling all the committees with these creatures, without difficulty guarantees itself a fully submissive majority at the congress. The congress constituted of the creatures of the central committee amiably cries ‘Hurrah’, approves all its successful and unsuccessful actions, and applauds all its plans and initiatives. Then, in reality, there would be in the party neither a majority nor a minority, *because we then would have realised the ideal of the Persian Shah*. (Emphasis added)

Or a conference of a Corbynised Labour Party.

Under Lenin’s (and Genghis Khan’s) heir, such a goal was indeed realised far beyond the darkest premonitions of Plekhanov and Luxemburg, though not those of Bukharin, who had experienced Stalin’s Tartar methods at first hand. Finding himself outmaneuvered in the Summer of 1928 by Stalin just as first Trotsky and then Zinoviev and Kamenev had been before him, ironically with the support of Bukharin, Bukharin described to the latter pair the methods his supposed ally of yesteryear had employed against him. Stalin was a ‘Genghis Khan, an unscrupulous intriguer, who sacrifices everything to the preservation of power.’ He cared nothing for doctrine or principles. ‘He changes his theories according to whom he needs to get rid of.’

In the manner of the riparian tyrannies of antiquity, to fulfil the Bolshevik Sargon’s grandiose Five-Year Plans, canals were dug by millions of slaves with their bare hands, and tribute squeezed from re-enslaved starving peasants, while in the mines and factories, the lethal whip of the NKVD cracked over the heads of a helot proletariat. At the summits of power stood a court permanently riven by murderous tribal blood feuds and periodically culled by savage purges, all presided over by a despot ascribed the infallibility of a deity, one who on his death, like a pharaoh, was embalmed and laid to rest in a pyramid-shaped tomb. The subject of countless devotional poems, hymns, statues and portraits (the last an honour also accorded Corbyn, together with a song of praise, and the aspiring British fascist *Fuehrer* Sir Oswald Mosley), Stalin was designated the ‘Father of the Peoples’, ruling over an empire cowed into submission and adulation by a truly Tartar, unending and all-pervading terror. (In midst of Putin’s imperial war against Ukraine, the statues of Stalin were returning.)

Further East again, the current official Head of State of North Korea or, as Corbyn’s Stalinist *confidante*, Andrew Murray respectfully (and comically) called it, ‘People’s Korea’, is not Kim Jong Un, but his long-deceased but officially still reigning grandfather, the founder of the dynasty, Kim Il Sung. To the south, China’s red emperor was officially credited with the healing powers of Jesus, allegedly performing miracles identical to those certified by the Vatican as qualification for sainthood, and whose teen-age disciples recited parables from his *Little Red Book*, the same book that Corbyn’s Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell read out from and waved defiantly at his Tory opposite number in the debate on his budget. (The - alleged - miracles have been documented (but not, I hasten to add, authenticated) by G. R. Urban in his *Miracles of Chairman Mao*.) A few longitudes further east again bring us close to the date-line frontier between East and West, and to a land ruled until 1945 by an emperor worshiped as a god, one for whom, like suicide bombers for Allah, his *Kamikazes* pilots were honoured to die. To the East of that

line we encounter the total negation of the cultures that lie to its West, the USA, for all its post-Obama vicissitudes and glaring social inequalities, is still the most free and technically advanced nation in the history of the human race.

Why this excursion into the history and peculiarities of the ancient East? Like Marx, I submit that for a number of compelling reasons, Islam is a religion best understood as the bastard offspring of an ancient, eastern, mystically-infused monolithic insect culture, one which, as with the Islamic *Ummah*, did not recognise any distinction between state and civil society, between god and Caesar or again, as with Mohammed, between prophet, law-giver and warrior. What we might call the Oriental anticipation of modern totalitarianism in both its secular and theocratic manifestations (where, not by accident, in North Korea the latter still survives) first emerged when, as Kautsky put it, society was at ‘the stage that the state finally reaches everywhere in the Orient’, where ‘there is, under normal circumstances, no material power that could be able to oppose the Sovereign inside his country’. Unlike western slave and feudal societies, those of the East had become stabilised, in effect frozen, at ‘the end point of the development of such oriental states.’ With the ruthless and systematic exploitation of their work forces, their rulers were never seriously threatened, let alone overturned, by the revolts and usurpations which periodically shook and even transformed the classical and feudal West...Rome’s risings of the plebs, the agrarian reforms of the Gracchi, the slave rebellion of Spartacus, the oratory of a Pericles and a Demosthenes, Magna Carta, the communist heresies of the millennial sects, the peasant revolts of England, Bohemia and Germany, the sometimes successful urban risings against the power and privileges of feudal lords.

Unlike in the West, in the ancient orient, all economic resources, and therefore political power, were concentrated in the hands of the absolutist state, which held them in trust for their owners, the gods, whose trustees, we can be sure, enjoyed their fruits. Since for ‘orthodox’ Leninists the sole criterion for a ‘workers’ state’ is not, as it was for Marx, the rule ‘of the immense majority in the interests of the immense majority’, but the absence of private ownership of the means of production, the Oriental despotisms of Sargon, Ramesses and Nebuchadnezzar would have qualified as a celestial variant of the same genre millennia before the emergence of their modern earth-bound successors. We should also include in the first category the Vatican City, whose property, according to cannon, law is also held in trust for god, and the North Korea of Kim the Third, ruled by his grandfather from a Stalinist Valhalla. Yet the Paris Commune of 1871, though it nationalized nothing, was described by Marx and Engels (but not Lenin) in the most glowing terms as a true government of the working classes.

The Oriental sanctification of property rights and usage is also a feature of early Islam, with the *Koran*’s injunction (Chapter 8, Verse 1): ‘The spoils of war belong to Allah and the messenger’, the difference being that in this case, the prophet gets to share the proceeds with Allah, and what is shared is largely the result of plunder by a parasitic, marauding desert army, not the fixed assets and produce of river-based agrarian oriental states. Yet despite significant differences in their sources of wealth, what they had in common was the absence of an enterprising and innovative property-owning class comparable to the bourgeoisie of nascent western capitalism, a lack which necessarily excluded the possibility of a political challenge to the rulers comparable to that mounted by the urban classes of Europe in the early modern era. And in the absence of an intelligentsia separate from and therefore

potentially opposed to the governing elite and its clergy, as in ancient Greece and Rome (prime examples are Aristotle and Lucretius), and the Europe of the Reformation, Renaissance and Enlightenment, cultural and intellectual stagnation necessarily became the norm in the ancient Orient, as has also been the case with Islam. Today, 22% of the world's population are Muslims. More than 50%, mainly women, are illiterate, compared to the global illiteracy rate of 10% for men and 17% for women, and compared to the world's infidels, substantially less again. As of 2022, only three Muslims had been awarded Nobel Prizes for science, compared to the 100% literate, work ethic-driven Jews, with their 145 science prizes and 0.2% of the world's population. As I like to say, not bad for 'apes and swine'.

Compared with the slave-based economy of Rome, whose low and declining productivity doomed the empire to conquest by German barbarians, the 'hydraulic' economies of the Orient were models of efficiency. But with bonded labour rigidly regulated by the despotic state bureaucracy, they left no role or space for the trade guilds of the medieval west, forerunners of the trade unions of the capitalist era, or the emergence of the estates of feudal Europe, which acted as a countervailing check on the powers of the monarchy and, over time acquired, sometimes violently, legislative functions alongside those of king and clergy. No such evolution occurred in the ancient east. Loyalties, such as were permitted, were not horizontal, formed by class, craft and calling, but vertical, to the elders of the clan or tribe, and above all, to the semi-divine despot.

Because of its unique social, political and economic structure, Oriental despotism provided the one exception to Marx's famous assertion that 'the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.' The consequences of this exception were and remain crucial. Islamic regimes in the Middle East, whether they be monarchist, clerical, military or 'presidential', including those that now and in the past have received support from part of the Left, have been able to deploy a variety of means to prevent the development of class conflicts in any way resembling those of the West, out of a fear that they will bring with them, as they did in the West, a process of destabilisation and radical political change that culminates in liberal, secular democracy. The most predominant of these means are political repression, the importation of *dhimmi*, infidel labour on a huge scale, clerical-brainwashing and dead-end distractions in which the frustrated and dissatisfied let off steam by means of state and clerical-fostered Jew-hatred and rallies against 'western imperialism', as in Iran, or by seeking glory in martyrdom. In Gaza, instead of bread and circuses, Jeremy's 'friends' provide tunnel digging and promises of 72 virgins for suicide bombers, and instead of gladiator contests and chariot races, youth training for Jihadism. No less effective, if less apparent, is a policy of social engineering that prevents the emergence of a western-style proletariat capable of organising itself and fighting for its own interests, be they economic or political. Instead, there has been fostered a client under-class, partly composed of bogus 'refugees', who are housed in 'camps' policed by Jihadi and criminal gangs, and funded by petro-charity and United Nations and European Union 'aid' programmes. Like ancient Rome's state-subsidised plebs, this client class is easily manipulated...witness the Hamas-orchestrated mass-assaults on the borders of Israel. Most hard physical work is by preference performed, as it was in Rome and in the hey-day of Islam, by cheap, unfree, usually non-Muslim labour imported from Africa and Asia, while the highly skilled are enticed from the infidel West by huge salaries. In Bahrain, 51% are foreign nationals, Oman, 44%. In Saudi

Arabia, 56% of its workers are from overseas, mainly India. In the United Arab Emirates, the proportion is 96%. To build stadia for the World Cup of 2022, Qatar's petro-despots imported two million workers, *twenty times* its own adult male population. Paid one tenth of Qatar's per capita GDP, the highest in the world at \$64,000, construction teams worked a ten-hour day in temperatures above 40 degrees centigrade. The death rate though heat exposure and accidents soared into the thousands. There were no protests from FIFA, some of whose officials had been bribed by the regime responsible for the deaths. Unlike the imperialist west, and as is the case throughout the Arabian Peninsula and beyond, in Qatar, the notion, let alone the reality of political freedom and workers' rights simply does not exist for its native, let alone its imported work force. Allah does not approve of strikes.

With the exception of Israel, the Middle East is a region where, as throughout the Islamic world with rare and transitory exceptions, independent trade unions have been banned for decades and leftist parties persecuted with a savagery equal to that inflicted on the left in Nazi Germany. This of course has proved no impediment to the far left's supporting such regimes in their resistance to the imperialist West, where workers for a century and more have belonged to trade unions and voted for parties of the left. In addition to its oppressive regimes, the task of creating a viable workers movement in the Islamic world is rendered all the more daunting by the cynical indifference of the western left to the plight of its workers. Instead of solidarity with labour, it sides with labour's oppressors if they are deemed sufficiently anti-imperialist, as for example in Iran, where workers have been flogged and sentenced to long prison terms, and their leaders and activists murdered for organising strikes, without any protests by British trade union or Labour Party leaders. There is also amongst the rural population in particular a deeply ingrained culture of deference to the powers that be which inhibits attempts to create organisations that clearly have a western origin, and are therefore seen as non or even anti-Islamic. Indeed, it is on these very grounds that the Ayatollahs deemed strikes to be incompatible with the ethos of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Kautsky made this very point when he contrasted the status and mentality of the lower classes of the ancient East with those of the West. '...we do not find in [classical] Greece that servile obsequiousness that in the Orient the peasant and the craftsman exhibit and feel towards the ruling classes.'

Unlike in the west today, where amongst believers, only a small and shrinking devout minority pays any heed to its clergy, numerous surveys have shown it is a different matter entirely for most Muslims. The overwhelming majority are not only deeply devout, but defer no less willingly to their clergy than did the subjects of the ancient Orient to those they truly believed were their divinely ordained masters. Even Muslim prostration at prayer is an inheritance from the identical act of submission to the god kings, gurus and emperors of the East, in Chinese called *kowtow*, Japanese, *dogeza*, Arabic, *sajud*, Hindi, *dandavat*, Punjabi, *mutha tekna*, and English...grovel. Given the cultural and geographic origins of Islam, is it by mere chance that while Greece gave the world the system of self-government of the people now embraced by nearly the entire West, together with the name by which it is known, in total contrast, one can visit an Islamic website, one of many with the same message, titled *Muslims Against Voting*, and read at its head a citation from the *Koran*, 'The right of legislation is for none but Allah.'? (Chapter 12, Verse 14. I refer the reader to Appendix G, where Ayatollah Khomeini explains in some detail the theological reasons for why this has to be so.)

These historically crucial divergences were and are in no way due to inborn racial characteristics. Their inheritance is via a culture, not genes. Along with much else, the East invented script, musical notation, astronomy and mathematics (the Sumerian's base number 60 is the origin of the 360 degrees of a circle and the compass, the 180 degrees of longitude and latitude, and the 60 seconds and minutes of modern time-keeping.) It invented coins, built the first cities, and codified the first laws. The Mongol settlement of the Americas culminated many thousands of years later in the no less sophisticated (and also no less stagnant) civilisations of the Aztecs and the Incas. The causes of eastern stagnation and western development lay and still, partly, lie in climate, geography, topography and geology, between one the one hand, a closed culture bounded by sand and an economy totally dependent on rivers, and on the other, an open one boarded by seas and oceans and endowed with a temperate climate, fertile soil and easily accessible fuel and minerals; and between slave, coerced or corvée labour, throughout history always the least productive, whether it be that of the ancient Orient, classical Rome and Greece or Tsarist Russia and former Soviet Union and, as Marx said, free labour, which uniquely evolved in the west after the decline of serfdom. The absence of these factors in the East determined that when, over the centuries and even millennia, change did occur in the Orient, it was never social or economic, merely dynastic, occasioned by an assassination or conquest by a neighbouring empire organised on an identical foundation. Such were Trotsky's 'hopeless rotations', breeding a profound conservatism and fatalism not only in the ruling caste, but even more so in those they ruled, a mindset resistant to and fearful of change, one that inherited by Islam, endures to this day. That is why Marx believed that the impulse for change in the East would necessarily have to come from the outside, from not only an industrialised but, what Islam fears the most, a democratic, and above all, secular West. (See Appendix X for endorsement of this conclusion by two Muslim commentators.)

This implacable cultural resistance to the 'modern' also assumes an explicit political character, as in the theocratic charters and declarations of Corbyn's 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah (passim) and the propaganda of the Islamic State. (Appendices J and M) Hence also the goal of Salafism and its kindred schools; a return to the undefiled purity of the original Islam of seventh century Arabia, to be achieved by *Jihad* against a west that it believes is the cause of their faith's adulteration and perversion. Al-Qaeda and ISIS, together with its various affiliates, adhere to this school, and it is also active in the Gaza Strip. An ISIS clone much favoured by the Socialist Workers Party for its 'militant Islam' is the Nigerian Boko Haram, 'No Western education', which surely says it all. (Massacres of school children and staff likewise proved no impediment to the Taliban's enrolment in the Sharia left's anti-imperialist front.) Other Salafist groups operate throughout the Islamic world, all of them engaging in terrorist activities, either against the West, or Islamic regimes they see as servile to it. In Algeria, the Islamic Salvation Front waged a ten-year civil war against the country's quasi-secular rulers, the National Liberation Front, that ended in defeat and cost the lives of at least 200,000 fellow Muslims, a carnage that unlike the far smaller Palestinian casualties arising from the terrorist *Intifadas* against Israel which occurred at the same time, went virtually unreported by the Western media, and unprotested, like the Kremlin's rapes of Afghanistan and Chechnya, by the left. The US-led war to remove the genocidal regime of Saddam Hussein, with its no more than 10,000 casualties, however

brought millions of protestors onto the streets of western capitals. This hatred and fear of the west is not unique to Sunni Islam. It is shared by its Shi'a version, and exemplified by the Ayatollah Khomeini's diatribe against all things occidental (See Appendix G), a xenophobia whose origins in the same region predate Islam by more than a thousand years. It first manifested itself when East and West first encountered each other in the protracted conflicts between the Greeks, who were planting the first seeds of democracy, and the Oriental despotism of the Persians, the wars that began with the invasions of Darius and Xerxes, recorded by the first true historian Herodotus, and ended with the conquests of Alexander the Great. Today, in what was once the eastern hinterland of Alexander's empire, what is essentially the same battle has been resumed, with the Ayatollahs of Iran pledging (as their ancient predecessors once did of Athens) to 'wipe Israel off the map' and bring 'death to America'. And in this undertaking, they have the support, true to its founder's 'Eastern Orientation', of what remains of historic Leninism. There is a profound irony that today's revolutionary left should see in a religion founded by an illiterate seventh century desert war lord a means to undermine a civilisation whose secular intellectual heritage fertilized the theorising of Marx and Engels, both of whom saw in the East not a force for liberation, but bastions of superstition, enslavement and barbarism.

And not only they. Trotsky in his last exile revealingly related how 'the late Leonid Krassin, old revolutionist, eminent engineer, brilliant diplomat and above all, intelligent human being, was the first, if I am not mistaken, to call Stalin an "Asiatic"', and that Kamenev, after he broke with Stalin in 1926, prophetically warned him, 'you can except anything from this Asiatic'. Stalin had Kamenev executed in 1936, and Trotsky assassinated in 1940. When party leaders complained of Stalin's intrigues and low morals, Lenin would shrug his shoulders and say, 'what else do you expect? He's an Asiatic', while his wife, Krupskaya, called Stalin 'an Asiatic monster'. To Trotsky she confided that her husband had said Stalin 'lacks the most elementary sense of honour...the most elementary decency'. Yet Lenin did not oppose his appointment to what proved to be the strategic post of party General Secretary. In time, Trotsky would come to an even more devastating judgement, denouncing his 'Asiatic' nemesis as 'the dirtiest, most criminal and most repulsive figure in history'. However, as we have seen, in Corbyn's immediate entourage were those who saw Stalin and his Chinese and North Korean counterparts in a very different light. With such exemplars, is it any wonder then that just prior to announcing his resignation on the eve of Labour's 2019 party conference, the last surviving member of Corbyn's original core staff, his Head of Policy, Andrew Fisher, accused his leader's team of disseminating a 'blizzard of lies and excuses' and, (like Stalin), 'lacking human decency'? And, given their elevated social origins, it was surely Corbyn's silver-spooned trio Seumas Milne, son of a former Director General of the BBC, Andrew Murray, scion of the ennobled Houses of Stanhope and Beauchamp, and Momentum founder and son of a property tycoon James Schneider, all alumni of Winchester and Oxford, whom Fisher accused of waging an *haute en bas* 'class war' against their underlings.

Unlike with Marx, Engels, Lenin, Krupskaya, Krassin, Kamenev, Bukharin and Trotsky, being called an 'Asiatic' was for Stalin not a term of abuse but a compliment, in an exchange with Japanese Foreign Minister Yosuke Matsuoka remarking: 'You are an Asiatic. So, am I', to which Matsuoka replied, 'We all are all Asiatics, let's drink to Asiatics.' On another occasion, Stalin took exception to

being called a 'European', declaring himself 'no European' but a 'Russified Georgian Asian' (When interviewed on YouTube, even most ethnic Russians proudly assert they are not Europeans.) So it was not by mere chance that in his rise to total power, Stalin collected around himself followers of a like caste of mind and background, hailing from the neck of the same Caucasian woods, where the ancient private lore of the clan still prevailed, and of which Stalin's vengeful *modus operandi* was the ultimate consummation. Thus at a banquet of the Party elite celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power, Stalin warned those present, many of whom were soon destined to die at his hand, 'We [meaning himself] shall destroy every enemy, even an old Bolshevik, *we shall annihilate his kith and his kin*', (emphasis added) a pledge that unlike many others, he honored to the letter.

Trotsky recalled in his (uncompleted) biography of Stalin how at sessions of the Bolshevik central committee, as the chief butt of Stalin's cronies, their swearing at him 'assumed an utterly shameless character' worthy of the 'Tiflis streets' of Stalin's native Georgia. (Stalin by birth was not a Georgian, but an Ossetian, a language related to Persian.) Trotsky would refer contemptuously to Stalin's camp followers as the 'Savage Division' after the name of the Muslim unit that served in the tsarist army during the First World War, and to Stalin himself, as 'an Asian despot, tyrant', a 'Genghis Khan', as another of his victims, Bukharin also once described him. Even though in each case, the pejorative use of 'Asian' and its analogue always referred to a cultural type, and not race, such statements as these (and I could have cited many others no less pungent) would today assuredly result in their authors being no-platformed by liberals and the left for the thought crime of cultural imperialism and probably also for racism. Thus far have we travelled from a time when Asia and its cognates served the revolutionary left as a synonym for the barbarism and wanton savagery of a Genghis Khan or Tamburlaine, and for the amorality in human relationships practised by the Islamic Caliphates

The cultural and moral relativism that is now *de rigueur* in polite society mutated in part from a school of anthropology that in the first three decades of the twentieth century, quite legitimately stressed the need to analyse all human cultures objectively, not, as the politically correct would say today, 'judgementally'. Over time, this approach acquired a political and moral dimension that its pioneers, in the first-place Ruth Benedict, never intended. Their goal had been to understand the workings of cultures encountered and colonised by the west, not to provide grounds for affording them 'respect' or to insulate them from criticism. Counterposed to this scientific approach is that of what is best described as the 'one-way' cultural relativism of the late Palestinian-born but western educated and based academic, Professor Edward Said, who denied the West had the ability to say anything of value about the East, while not ascribing to the East the same incapacity in its evaluation of either itself or, what is equally to the point, the West. It is worth noting in this context that according to an Islamic website, it was Professor Said who introduced to the west the term 'Islamophobia', a word that despite its literal meaning, which is to harbour an irrational fear of Islam, has been very effectively used to silence and even criminalise critical remarks made in public about the religion of peace, and even to have them defined and likewise criminalised as a form of racism.

Said's 'Orientalist' thesis was first propounded in 1978, in his immensely influential but now, in the judgement of some, discredited book *Orientalism*, where he made the ludicrous claim that 'since the time of Homer, every [sic] European in

what he could say about the Orient, was a racist, an imperialist, and almost totally ethnocentric'. We have it then on the authority of Professor Said that beginning with the 'time of Homer', believed to be *circa* 1,000 BC and consequently about which we know next to nothing, every westerner over the succeeding millennia who ever concerned themselves with the East, and that as we have seen includes Kautsky, Hegel, Marx, Lenin and Trotsky, was a racist. This claim raises some intriguing questions. Are all those who write about the East (and today that will often as not mean Islam) attracted to the subject *because* they are racists? Or does its study somehow transform them *into* racists? If the latter, is the subject, and of course especially its Islamic aspects, which concerned Said the most, to be 'off limits' for all decent (western) folk, lest it infects those who study it with anti-Muslim bigotry? If so, then precisely why and how does studying the Orient always turn a non-racist into a racist? Said does not say.

There is another possibility, which has the double virtue of greatly simplifying matters and best fitting Said's thesis: As is claimed by some schools of 'critical theory', all (presumably white) western people, principally men, whether they display an interest in the Orient or not, are, for whatever reason or reasons, racists. Consequently, all that western Orientalists do is reveal this universally shared racism in their chosen field of study. So, inverting Said's Orientalism thesis, we can describe his critique of a racist West as 'Occidentalism', though he would have us believe that being from the 'east', his is a mode of thinking that illuminates rather than distorts and obscures. In every sense the reverse of a bigoted 'Orientalism', 'Occidentalism' thus enables those like Professor Said not only to grasp truths about the East that are closed to racist western minds, but to make negative judgements about the West that because of its ingrained (or inborn) biases, it cannot or dare not make about itself. What is most extraordinary is that Said's claim to have exposed as incurably biased the academic pretensions of western Oriental scholarship is not, he believes, invalidated by his own remarkably frank admission that he has 'no interest in, much less capacity for showing what the true Orient and Islam really are'. But how can one detect and expose a falsehood if one does know, and is even not concerned to know, the facts of the matter in dispute? Said evidently subscribes to the fallacious *ad hominem* argument that is sufficient to know who is saying what, rather than what is being said.

In fact, very much in the manner of his post-modernist contemporaries, whom he cites with approval, Said does not seem to think there is such a thing as the truth, or even that there is an objective reality *per se* that can even if only hypothetically be knowable. In the work of the Orientalists, 'truth, in short, becomes a function of learned judgement, not of the material itself', this perhaps being akin to the unknowable Kantian 'thing in itself'. Then we learn that even this 'material itself' 'seems to owe its existence to the Orientalists', conjured out of nothing by bigoted minds, which is most certainly not Kantian. Is it not then a cause for wonder that Professor Said was able to see clearly through this fog of post-modernism and the mists of time to discern, without on this occasion the least doubt, that from as far back as the time of Homer, those who have studied the East have been racists, down to the last man, and today, woman? This is a world of shadows of shadows. One is left more than a little bemused, and wondering...does the 'Orient' even exist at all? Said apparently thinks not, because he describes its study as 'a form of paranoia, knowledge of another kind, say, from historical knowledge', a 'Western ignorance which becomes more refined, more complex, not

some body of positive Western knowledge which increases in size and accuracy'...objectives which Said elsewhere suggests are by their very nature unattainable. And as Said himself admits, he too not only lacks this knowledge himself but has no interest in acquiring it! The sole purpose of the exercise, one that as we have seen, has nothing to do with investigating the nature of the East, is to slander any scholar in the West who does undertake such a study as merely an academic apologist for and accomplice of western imperialism:

I doubt that it is controversial, for example, to say that an Englishman in India or Egypt in the late nineteenth century took an interest in those countries that was never far from their status in his mind as British colonies. To say this may seem quite different from saying that all academic knowledge about India and Egypt is somehow tinged and impressed with, violated by, the gross political fact of imperialism- and yet *that is what I am saying* in this study of Orientalism. (Emphasis in original)

Yes, '*...all academic knowledge...*'

How did this claim ever come to be taken seriously? Surely only academics tormented and utterly disoriented by post-colonial guilt could have so lost their intellectual bearings as to give credence to such nonsense, of which the intended and all too frequently achieved result is western prostration before the wonders of Islam. However, cowing those who have first-hand knowledge of these glories is not so easily achieved. When Kanan Makiya, the leftist Iraqi author of the anti-Saddam *Republic of Fear*, took Said to task for his attribution to the West of all the failings (such as they are) of the Arab world, Said resorted to some decidedly un-professorial language by denouncing him as a 'guinea pig witness' and 'native informant' for the United States, in other words, a traitor to Saddam Hussein...all because he described his Ba'athist regime as it was...a fascist dictatorship no less brutal and genocidal than Hitler's. (See conclusion to Appendix T) Even Arabs, it seems, can succumb to 'Orientalism' when they make the fatal error of valuing truth above tribal loyalty to a faith and a culture. One can only draw the conclusion that Said's 'Orientalism' is little more than a pseudo-academic device to warn off, or if that fails, discredit with accusations of racism, any western scholar who sets out to examine critically certain aspects of Islamic societies, theology and culture.

What now goes by the name of cultural relativism has its academic origins in a number of disciplines, principally philosophy and certain trends in contemporary anthropology, where they concerned themselves with issues of ethics and morals. Perhaps inevitably, because in the background there loomed issues associated with the impact of colonial rule on the cultures being studied, quite early on, anthropology became heavily politicised, and has remained so to this day. A sign of things to come were the academic debates that preceded the adoption, in 1948, of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The American Anthropological Association challenged the very concept of universal human rights on grounds very similar to those advanced by dictatorial regimes in China, North Korea, Cuba and Islamic states today. In a paper submitted to the UN, it argued that such a declaration must 'do more than phrase respect for the individual as individual'. It also had to 'take into full account the individual as a member of a social group of which he [sic] is a part, whose sanctioned modes of life shape his behaviour and with whose fate his own is thus inextricably bound.' Thus in a few

specious phrases, the rights of the 'individual as individual', which were central to the UN Declaration, were conjured away. The individual was to be subordinated instead to 'sanctioned [by whom?] modes of behaviour that shape his [and under Islam, even more so, her] life,' to which he is 'inextricably bound', and therefore, over which he has no control or say.

As we have seen, this argument has been deployed by *dhimmi* western feminists to justify the domination of Muslim women by Islamic patriarchy. And as a definition of what now goes by the name of 'identify politics', this can hardly be surpassed. It ignores the fact that the real, living human being, independently and irrespective of any 'culture', has his or her biologically determined material wants, which are common to the entire species...food, shelter etc...and must be met to ensure its thriving and reproduction just as with any other species. The one essential difference is that unlike the environment of other species, mankind's culture over time, through the development of technology and science and their action upon nature, has become more and more a human construct. The inevitable consequence is that such an environment, or as we say in this case, 'culture', that fails to provide these pre-requisites of life is doomed to decline and even extinction, and along with it, those that live under its sway, unless they can either escape to one that does (as millions of mainly Muslim migrants from Islam are now doing) or, by their own efforts, through collective action, possibly with outside assistance or intervention (such as that envisaged by Hegel and Marx), are able to create such a culture for themselves. In other words, contrary to the assertion cited above, the relationship between a culture and those that live within it a two-way process.

But more than this. 'Man doth not live by bread alone'. Evolution has endowed the human species with a brain like no other. To function productively, its needs must be met no less than the rest of the body it serves and controls. The history of the human race has proved that the freer the human mind is to investigate the reality we inhabit, to store, expand, transmit and have access to knowledge about this reality, to communicate and collaborate with other brains, to dispute and to differ, the more these freedoms enhance not only the material well-being of the societies where they flourish, but through the process of 'globalisation', humanity as whole. (See above the comments of Marx on this subject.)

The spectacular advances achieved in world health by a tiny number of medical scientists (many of them Jews with their more than fifty Nobel Prizes), operating in conditions of free intellectual inquiry, is just one of many proofs that a culture which, by a process analogous to Darwinian natural selection, succeeds in liberating the human mind from secular and religious dogmas, demonstrably also brings, if allowed to, material benefits no less than intangible cultural riches to the entire human species, proving that liberal democracy is a meme whose time has come. Judged by this secular criterion (and how can there be any other worthy of consideration?) western liberal, pluralist democracy is infinitely superior to the stifling totalitarian culture of Islam, one that punishes the mildest dissent while rewarding slavish, even fanatical conformity. So if we can speak in any sense of the 'natural state' of the human species, it is not passively to accept being, as the American Anthropological Association has it, 'intrinsically bound' by 'fate' to 'modes of life' that 'shape its behaviour' but to be active, choosing, changing and controlling its individual behaviour, obviously within certain historical and natural limits, and by collective action, determining the shape and direction of society as a whole. If humanity did not possess the intrinsic capacity to do this, we would still

be living in caves. Humanity, or rather a certain proportion of it, has learned, at great cost, to create through a series of revolutions and reforms, the methods, institutions and principles of liberal democracy which have made this human progress possible. This liberal democracy of the 'west' is superior to all other political cultures, past and present, not because it judges them by its own supposedly subjective criteria, as the cultural relativists claim, but because liberal democracy is itself judged, like all other cultures, by a higher, in fact ultimate, objective criterion, which, in the light of overwhelming evidence, is that however imperfectly and partially, it affords the most fruitful principles, institutions and conditions yet devised for the prospering and thriving of the human species, both materially and mentally, as it engages in its ever more diverse and complex activities.

Yet although the 'west' has abolished famines, slavery, the persecution of sexual minorities and legal discrimination against women, liberated labour, enfranchised all adults, hugely extended the span of life, invented the telescope and microscope, radio, television and powered flight, has travelled to the moon and back, landed a space ship on Mars and one of the moons of Jupiter, sending back to earth scientific data and clear images of their surfaces, split the atom and harnessed its energy, discovered DNA and unravelled the mechanisms of life...despite all this and so much more, the culture of intellectual freedom that made all this possible is, we are told by the relativists, no better than one that has proved itself incapable of achieving by its own efforts a single one of these advances, and whose main preoccupation is with crushing human freedom and either subjugating or killing those who challenge its dominance or deny its dogmas.

Over the post-war years, this cultural relativism, again fed by liberal and leftist colonial guilt, bifurcated and gave birth to its analogue, moral relativism. This poisonous doctrine, under whose rubric any moral abomination can be committed so long as it is not by white male Europeans or North Americans, was neatly summed up by one of its advocates, the anthropologist Alison Dundes Renteln: 'There can be no value judgements that are true, that is, absolute judgements independent of specific cultures'. Unless, that is, they are made by Alison Dundes Renteln, as she does here. Ernst Krieck, a Nazi ideologist, agreed. Here he is, explaining the meaning of 'race truth', or 'thinking with one's blood':

Each race in each period must form its life according to its own law and fate, and to this law its own scholarship, with all other spheres of life, is also subject. The idea of humanism, with the teaching of pure human reason and absolute spirit founded upon it, is a philosophical principle of the eighteenth century [that is, of the Enlightenment] caused by the conditions of that time. Is it in no sense binding on us as we live under different conditions...Such a race-bias carries its certainty in itself and not in logical criteria of the truth.

Just as Renteln says, 'there can be no absolute judgments independent of specific cultures.' Critical theory' Cals this 'ways of knowing, derived from 'lived experience'. (See Appendix B) The question needs to be put to those who argue thus: are there no human practices sanction by a culture which render that culture inferior to a culture that does not permit? We can cite the examples of the Aztecs, who conducted hum sacrifices on a vast scale to their sun god Inti; the Chinese practice of binding girls' feet; the extension of African women's necks with hoops,

female genital mutilation and child marriage, rife on a number of Islamic countries; the Indian Hindu custom of widow burning, *sati*, which still continues, etc etc. The consistent application of the principle in question requires this answer: that all we can say about these practices, or any others of a like nature, is that they exhibit different patterns of human behaviour no better or worse, given that these terms retain their original meaning, than cultures that reject and regard such practices with abhorrence, since, unlike 'different', 'better' and 'worse' are subjective judgments lacking, so the post-modernists tell us, valid objective standards by which to judge them.

Legend has it that following the outlawing of *sati* by the British, an outraged Indian insisted that burning widows alive should continue to be done 'according to our custom', to which an English colonial official replied, 'do it, and we will hang you according to our custom'. The logic of multi-culturalism surely leads to the conclusion that the widow-burners were in the right, and the British guilty of cultural imperialism, since 'there can be no absolute judgements independent of specific cultures'. A comforting thought as the flames begin to lick around the widow's body. If it is just as the Nazi Krieck, the critical theorists, the post modernists and the anthropologist Renteln say, that 'there can be no absolute value judgements', then surely the same principle of 'relativism' applies to the moral conduct of individuals as it does to individuals collectively grouped in a culture, that one person's behaviour is no better or worse than anyone else's, only different. Would a cultural relativist, for fear of being 'judgemental' not report the sexual abuse of child? Ironically, those who callously say 'none of my business' and those who high-mindedly say 'I must not be judgemental' will, in such situations, behave in the same way and 'walk on the other side', leading to the same result, the sexual abuse of a child. In their ultimate applications, cultural and moral relativism break down because they would result in a world in which theoretically all can behave as they please, as if, to coin a phrase, 'there is no such thing as society', a world where, sooner rather than later, the strong would rule and possibly, as indeed happened in Nazi Germany with its euthanasia programme, even exterminate the weak. It would be a world without any notion or institutions of international law and justice, of being my global brother's keeper, only the law of jungle, a world that for fearing of being judgemental, would not have conducted at Nuremburg the trials of the greatest criminals in human history, declared war on Nazi Germany when Hitler invaded Poland, liberated Kuwait from occupation by Saddam Hussein, or supplied the means for Ukraine to defy Putin's invasion.

Cultural relativism in its normal application is concerned with cultures that exist in the same time period, for example today's liberal democratic 'west' and the Islamic 'east'. But if its principles are valid, they should also be no less applicable to the same society at different moments in its history, since here too, we are comparing cases of societies founded on contrasting principles, only separated in time rather than space. For example, the cultural relativist would have to assert that no meaningful value judgements can be made regarding the racist culture of a nation which once enslaved its black population and of the culture that 150 years later outlawed racial discrimination and made possible the election of a member of that race as its president not once, but twice; or between the misogynistic culture of a nation which denied women the right to vote, and that a century later, had elected two women as Prime Minister; between one that first sent children to work in coal mines and another that later sent them to school free of charge. If there are no

objective judgements we can make about such differences and the principles that underlie them, then the whole idea of human progress, of our ascent (if indeed ascent it is) from the Old Stone Age to the present has been nothing but an illusion. All we have is change, often at great cost, but no improvement. If this is true, and the logic of cultural relativism leads inescapably to the conclusion that it is, the west has no rational grounds or moral right to make comparative judgements of any kind about any culture in human history. All we are entitled to say about them is, they are different. However, when it comes to the culture of Islam, some, like King Charles (See Appendix IX) and guilt-ridden, west-hating leftists and white feminists (See Chapter 24) make an exception to this rule, insisting it is superior.

A perfect illustration of how cultural relativism and dhimmitude has permeated modern 'progressive' thinking is the BBC's regular practice of describing the greatest products of western culture in ways that deny their universal status and significance. For example, broadcast performances of J.S. Bach's most sublime works, the B Minor Mass and the St. Mathew Passion, are routinely introduced as 'pinnacles of western music', and Wagner's no less sublime *Tristan und Isolde* as, on one occasion, a 'landmark in western music', thereby leaving the listener to infer that this qualification could mean that there is even greater music to be heard hailing from the East. The objection that the BBC is rightly taking care not to make judgements about something so subjective, abstract and elusive as music is nonsense, because a judgement has already been made...the works in question are deemed to be supreme examples of *western* music. So, if it is legitimate for the BBC to make such judgements concerning the relative merits of a vast range of western composers of different styles, times and places, why stop there? Why not *all* music? Who, for example, describes Mount Everest as the tallest peak in *Asia*? Does the BBC do this for fear of giving 'offence'? If so, to whom, precisely? Or does the BBC really believe that Bach's or Wagner's music has to take second place to works created by 'eastern' composers? If so, who are they?

If the BBC feels obliged to resort to geographical criteria when evaluating the music featured on its programmes, why not 'northern' music, since all the recognised giants of the classic genres hail from above the equator? The puzzled listener is left wondering...if Bach is only supreme in the West, as the BBC announcer implied, where can I hear the superior music of the East? And yet 'the East' or, *pace* Professor Said, the Orient, has no such reservations about the relative merits of 'western' concert music. Japan, South Korea and now China are just some of the countries in the East that want to hear and play little else. Instrumentalists and ensembles from the 'East' now feature regularly in 'western' concert halls and broadcasting and recording studios, sweeping the board at national and international competitions, all choosing to perform music that originated far from their native lands, whereas significantly, the reverse does not happen and no one expects it to. They would consider absurd the idea of a system of musical apartheid in which the music of 'east' and 'west' cannot or should not be judged by the same criteria. Where it is free to choose (and this of course excludes most of the Islamic world, where western music is either severely frowned upon or banned entirely) the 'East' has made its choice, and, when it is allowed to, it is voting with its pockets, ears, lips, vocal chords and fingers for the music of the 'West'. Music, by its very nature, is a universal medium of expression and communication, and it is no sin to judge one composition or performance superior to another, irrespective of where its creator may hail from.

In the world of the arts, cultural relativism and its attendant 'sensitivities' reign supreme, not least, as one would expect, in matters Islamic. As was the case with *The Satanic Verses*, following the lead of the Iranian Ayatollahs, the film *The 300*, which depicts the Battle of Thermopylae between Sparta and Persia, was judged by some critics to be directed against Islam, even though the conflict took place in 480 BC, over a thousand years before its birth and even longer before the imposition of Islam upon the Persians. Thus the film was not judged on its artistic merits, but whether it might give 'offence' to Muslims. Where this kind of thinking can lead was demonstrated by the treatment handed out to the anti-Nazi film *Schindler's List* in a number of Islamic states. Malaysian censors complained that the film depicted Jews as 'intelligent' and 'stout-hearted', which was bad enough. But what was even worse, the Nazis were shown as 'brutal'. Indonesian clerics demanded a ban on the film because it was 'too sympathetic' to the Jews. The film was also banned on similar grounds in Jordan, with its substantial Palestinian population, and in the home of Hezbollah, Lebanon. Director Steven Spielberg had no doubt that the bans were 'certainly an attack on the Jews'. Some today might see them as blows struck against Zionism.

Islamic censorship has other, more direct ways of ensuring that its sensitivities are respected in infidel nations. It can issue death threats, unleash mayhem on the streets, as it did in the Rushdie and Danish cartoon affairs, or take the more direct route of murder, as it did in Paris in the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre and the Japanese translator of *The Satanic Verses*. The Dutch film-maker Theo Van Gogh's film, *Submission*, depicting the misery of a woman's life under Islam, led to his assassination and attempted decapitation on an Amsterdam street. In court, his killer, Mohammed Bouryeri, justified the murder by claiming that 'the [Sharia] law compels me [sic] to chop off the head of anyone who insults Allah and his prophet'. This was an obvious, and indisputably appropriate reference to the already quoted Chapter 8, Verse 19 of the *Koran*, where Muslims are instructed by Allah to 'smite them [those who disbelieve] above the necks'. It is not a comforting thought for non-Muslims that all surveys show that not only the former Archbishop of Canterbury, but a clear majority of Muslims wish to see Sharia law adopted in the UK, as they do throughout almost all their diaspora.

As the west knows to its cost, murder, bombing and arson rank high among the favoured methods for securing compliance with the dictates of Sharia cultural criticism. Following the publication of *The Satanic Verses*, bookstores that were attacked for selling the novel included two in Berkeley, California, four in London, and one each in Guildford, Nottingham, Peterborough, York and High Wycombe. Following these attacks, some book chains stopped selling the book, while others hid it under the counter. Islamic terror works. The first book burning in the UK, 55 years after that by Nazi students in Berlin, took place in Bolton on December 2, 1988, watched by a mob of 7,000 cheering and chanting Muslims, followed by another in Bradford, and an anti-Rushdie march of Muslims led through his Leicester constituency by Labour MP, close friend of Corbyn, devout Christian and cocaine and prostitute user Keith Vaz. On May 27, 1989, Muslims gathered in Trafalgar Square to watch the burning of Salman Rushdie in effigy and to demand the banning of his novel. The pop singer Yusuf Islam, aka Cat Stevens, as converts so often feel obliged to do, proved his zeal for his new faith by announcing that if by chance, he should discover Rushdie's whereabouts, 'I might ring somebody who might do more damage to him than he would like. I'd try to phone the Ayatollah

Khomeini and tell him exactly where this man is'. No police action ensued as a result of this threat. Had a similar threat been made by an infidel to a prominent Muslim, there are good grounds for believing that it would have done.

In the east, the Islamic mobilisation was naturally on a much larger and more violent scale. In Turkey, officially a secular state but with a largely Muslim population, the venue of a book fair was burned to the ground by a Muslim mob after its participants refused to hand over for lynching Aziz Nesin, who had announced his intention to translate and publish the novel. 37 died in the blaze. Twelve died and another 40 were wounded in an anti-Rushdie riot in Bombay. The religion of peace (and Obama's 'tolerance'). Contrary to what is generally believed, and UK politicians and diplomats falsely claim, the Khomeini *fatwa* issued on February 14, 1989, and the financial reward for its execution of one million dollars (index linked for inflation, as of 2022, it stood at \$3 million) is still operative. As Iranian officials explained on more than one occasion, a *fatwa* can only be revoked by the cleric who imposed it. Ayatollah Khomeini died on June 3, 1989. There was at least one positive outcome to this Islamic onslaught on freedom of the press. The clerical cretins who set it in motion could not possibly have understood that whereas banning a book incites Muslims to burn its pages and murder its author, amongst civilised people it encourages the curious to read it. So, predictably, sales soared, making the novel a best seller throughout the western world. And there was nothing Allah the all-powerful could do about it.

Self-censorship is without doubt morally the most indefensible of all restrictions on the freedom of expression, firstly because it is voluntary and secondly, as it gathers momentum, spreading like gangrene, it can exert considerable pressure on those who are reluctant to comply with it. Hard though it is to credit, in 2006, Berlin's Deutsche Opera company, presumably anticipating objections and possibly violence from the Islamic offence industry, cancelled its production of Mozart's opera *Idomeneo* because its stage set had featured representations of not only Jesus and Buddha, but Mohammed. A small detail...the opera is set in the time of the Trojan wars, 1,500 years or more before the emergence of Islam. But no matter. A shame, because we know how Muslims love their opera, and are always seen in large and enthusiastic numbers at all the big festivals.

Professional Muslim offence-takers would have had a field day with Mozart's *Entführung aus dem Serail* (The Abduction from the Harem). A Spanish noblewoman and her English maid, Blonde, are captured by pirates and sold as slaves to serve in the harem of a Turkish Pasha, a Spanish convert to Islam (a possible clue as to why he later sets them free). Their two lovers arrive to rescue them. Mozart then wastes no time in introducing us to the ways of Islam. Osmin, the Pashas' right-hand man, rattles off a list of punishments awaiting the two infidels. Some of them we encounter in this work: 'By the Prophet's beard, by day and by night I rack my brains, and I won't rest until I see you killed no matter how much care you take. First, you'll be beheaded, then impaled on red hot spikes [a Turkish favourite], then burned, then manacled and drowned, finally flayed alive.' Like other enlightened men of his time, among them Voltaire and Beethoven, the Freemason Mozart was a great admirer of England's liberties, and so he gives us an exchange which wokistas would condemn as Islamophobic: Blonde: 'Pasha this, Pasha that! Girls are not goods to be given away. I'm an English woman, born to freedom, and I defy anyone who would force me to do his will.' Osmin: 'O Englishmen what fools you are to let your [sic] women have their own way.'

Presumably anticipating the usual high proportion of Muslim art lovers amongst its visitors, shortly after the London transport bombings by four Muslim terrorists on July 7, 2005, the London Tate removed from public view a sculpture inscribed with holy texts, including a selection from the *Koran*. The gallery's Director, Stephen Deuchar, offered the following explanation for his act of supine self-censorship: 'It was a very difficult decision, but we made it due to the exceptional circumstances of this summer and in the light of opinions that we value regarding religious sensitivities.' The murder of 52 civilians and the wounding of 770 no more than an 'exceptional circumstance'? The 'sensitivities' of those who shared the religion of its perpetrators, and in many cases, approved of their deed, are to be valued more than freedom of artistic expression? Instead of these quite disgusting euphemisms, evasions and downlight lies, why not admit, as others have done in similar circumstances, what was the real reason; a perfectly justified fear of an Islamic attack on London Tate? There is no shame in admitting this, only in inventing pretexts that no-one takes seriously. Two years on, and the Tate Modern was demonstrating to those 'whose opinions we value' but who, sadly, do not value western art, that the London art world had turned over a new, Islam-friendly leaf, mounting a video exhibit about the world's religions...that is, all bar one...that of peace, fear of a violent reaction by its followers having led to its exclusion.

In January 2006, in Middelkerke, Belgium, the exhibiting of an installation that displayed a fibre glass Saddam Hussein floating in a fish tank was likewise banned lest it offend Muslim 'sensitivities'. Saddam was of course just one of many Muslim leaders renowned for their 'sensitivity', one of his pleasures being the sight of his victims, not swimming in a fish tank, but dissolving in one filled with liquid acid. In the same year, a *posse* of equally sensitive young Muslim art critics wielding iron bars had attacked a Paris café staging an exhibition of cartoons mocking religion. According to a report that appeared in the *Middle East Times*, but not in the UK or US media, the owner of the café 'placed white sheets of paper inscribed with the word "censored" over the cartons that were attacked by the gang'. In 2007, a photograph making a pointed reference to Iran's policy of executing homosexuals, namely of two gay Iranian exiles wearing masks of Mohammed and his nephew Ali, was withdrawn from display in The Hague Municipal Museum because, explained Director W[h]im[p] van Krimpen, 'certain people [sic] in our society might perceive them as offensive'. One is left wondering...who could these 'certain people' possibly be? Surely not Muslims, because Sharia law sanctions the execution of homosexuals and ten Islamic states actually enforce it. So why should they feel 'offended'? When in protest the artist withdrew all her work from the museum and accepted an offer to exhibit at a museum in Gouda, its Director immediately received the usual death threats and had to be placed under police protection. The invitation was then withdrawn.

Offending exhibits need not have even the remotest connection with or allusion to Obama's religion of tolerance to fall foul of self-imposed Sharia censorship. When, in 2006, the London Whitechapel Art Gallery found that 'space constraints' prevented the exhibiting of nude dolls by the surrealist artist Hans Bellmer, the Curator later admitted that the real reason was that the nudity of the dolls would offend the large Muslim population living in the area. One can just picture the scene, itself surreal: devotees of a faith that forbids any depiction of nature enthusiastically pouring eagerly into the gallery, only to turn tail and flee in horror (or alternatively, stage a riot) at the sight of a collection of naked dolls. And yet something like thus

did take place when in 2008, a Muslim gang burst into the Berlin Galerie Nord and demanded the removal of a poster titled 'Stupid Stone' depicting the *Kaaba*, the sacred stone, pagan in origin, in the Mecca Grand Mosque. The exhibition was temporarily closed pending the upgrading of security.

In May 2019, after complaints by Muslims, paintings at an exhibition at the London Saatchi gallery were covered over at the suggestion of the *dhimmi* artist, who described their concealment as 'a respectful solution'. Respectful to whom or what? Obviously not freedom of artistic expression or the right of non-Muslims to look at what they came to see. Respect for the right of Muslims to censor what offends their theological sensitivities? Most certainly, as author Stephen King discovered when, in the same month, his *dhimmi* publisher pulled his novel *The Siege of Tel Aviv* after complaints that its futuristic plot, a five-nation Muslim invasion of Israel, was 'Islamophobic', despite its being warmly recommended by a Muslim, Maajid Nawaz. How can the novel be 'Islamophobic', when the destruction of Israel is the dream of countless millions of Muslims across the Islamic world and beyond, is inscribed in the theologically-inspired charters of Corbyn's 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah, and was indeed the goal of the five Muslim nations that attacked Israel at its birth in 1948?

In the world of theatre, Sharia self-censorship led to all references to Islam being removed from performances of Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*. So far as I am aware, there has been no such redaction of the same author's *Jew of Malta* to protect Jewish sensitivities, nor for that matter of Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford's *Merchant of Venice*. And, I hasten to add, neither should there be. In June 2007, the normally iconoclastic London Royal Court Theatre cancelled an adapted reading of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* out of fear that its allusions to Islam might cause offence to Muslims. (The author died in BC 386, 957 years before the birth of Mohammed.) The Royal Court's Director, Ramin Gray, admitted that playwrights 'feel they can't write openly about what they feel is maybe the most important topic facing our society at the moment.' This view was shared by Nicholas Hytner of the National Theatre, whose policy it was 'not to put on a play attacking Islam unless it was by a Muslim.' As if...

Not all directors rolled over so easily, especially when they were French. In 1994, to mark the 300th anniversary of the birth of the leading spirit of the Enlightenment, the director, Hervé Loichemol, planned to stage Voltaire's play *Fanaticism, or Mahomet the Prophet* in Geneva. The inevitable organised protests, orchestrated by the self-styled 'moderate' Muslim Tariq Ramadan, forced a cancellation of the project. Nothing daunted, in 2005, Loichemol re-located the staging to the small French town of Saint-Genis-Pouilly on the border with Switzerland. Again, alerted by its title, but never having seen it, local self-appointed Muslim leaders denounced the play as an 'insult to the entire Muslim community' and demanded the play's cancellation in order to, as they put it, 'preserve the peace', a scarcely-veiled threat of Muslim violence if the production went ahead. Refusing to yield to religious blackmail (this was secular France, not cravenly woke England) the town's Mayor mobilised its police to protect the theatre from a besieging Muslim mob who were burning cars and garbage cans *over a play*. Mayor Hubert Bertrand described the situation as 'quasi-insurrectional'. But because he stood firm, he proved that Islamic intimidation can be defeated and western culture protected.

In November 2015, after protests by Muslims in faraway Nigeria and Saudi Arabia, a Glasgow cinema cancelled a screening of a film titled *The Message* about the early life of Mohammed. Even though the showing was under the auspices of the Islamic Society of Britain and did not depict the prophet (quite an achievement for a film devoted to him), it was deemed unacceptable because some of the actors playing his companions were not themselves Muslims. In 2013, a baroque painting of the nude goddess Juno was removed from the restaurant of the *dhimmi* Swedish Parliament in order to avoid giving offence to Muslims. With the same concern in mind, when President Hassan Rouhani of Iran visited Rome in January 2016 for trade talks, once again, in conformity with Sharia law, which bans the depiction of the human body, naked or otherwise, or any other living or otherwise natural object for that matter, all the nude statues in the city's Capitoline Museum were boarded up for the duration of his stay, a capitulation (no pun intended) to Sharia law that was denounced by its critics as 'cultural suicide'. This, in the home of the *Renaissance*? Students of football history will recall an equally obsequious and no less futile gesture. In May 1938, to further Chamberlain's policy of appeasing Hitler, on the orders of the Foreign Office, an English football team gave the Nazi salute before their friendly (sic) match against Germany in Berlin. Little more than a year later, Britain was at war with a no longer friendly Nazi Germany. Less than two months after the boxing of the nudes in Rome, distinctly unfriendly Muslims staged a massacre in Brussels.

These are just some of many examples of Muslims enforcing on the west their Sharia censorship of the arts, nearly always with the uncomplaining compliance of those whose duty it was to uphold and defend the right of creative artists to complete freedom of expression, and to have the public display, sale, performance or publication of their work protected from religiously-inspired thuggery. Putin's Russia also exercises a similar clerical censorship, not to protect the sensitivities of Islam, but those of a Russian Orthodox Church that subsequently endorsed his invasion of Ukraine. The stage settings of a production of Wagner's *Tannhauser* in Novosibirsk were deemed offensive to Christians after protests by Orthodox zealots were taken up by the church's increasingly influential and ultra-nationalist hierarchy. When the theatre director refused to make any changes to the production, he was sacked, we can safely assume with President Putin's approval, by the Minister of Culture, and future performances of the opera banned. Of Russia, more than any other country, we can surely say, *plus la change, plus c'est la meme chose*.

Even the UK's, and arguably the world's most prestigious academic publishers, Oxford University Press, have been unable to resist the pressures of a Sharia self-censorship, in January 2015 issuing instructions to authors to avoid using the words 'pigs or sausages, or anything else that could resemble pork'. Then in 2023, determined to prove that its music publishing was up to speed on the latest woke buzz words, OUP announced it was 'committed to promoting and maintaining a culture of equality, diversity and inclusion' and that it recognised that 'many groups are under-represented in our music catalogue, and we are committed to changing and rapidly improving this through future publishing. As part of this commitment, we are currently accepting submissions from composers who: Live with a disability, and/or are women; and/or identify on the broader spectrum of gender; and/or are from under-represented ethnic groups; and/or are from a lower socio-economic group.' So once again, go with the flow; quotas instead of quality. genes instead of genius. If OUP's music publishing policy

had been the rule in the baroque, classical and romantic eras, we today would never have heard a note of Bach, Mozart or Brahms. But possibly we would have from Beethoven, because although like Brahms, Mozart and Bach, he was white, male and heterosexual, in his later years, he was deaf. Very much in the same spirit, in February 2023, Cambridge University announced (and then after protests that it was racist, withdrew) possibly illegal admission criteria for a postgraduate course, open only to ‘black, British black, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or British Pakistani, British Bangladeshi students’.

Another world-famous publisher, Penguin Books, entered the lists in the good fight for diversity and inclusivity by triggering its new edition of the works of Roald Dahl. The task was carried out by ‘sensitivity readers’, a euphemism for censors, employed by an Orwellian outfit called ‘Inclusive minds’, who described themselves as being ‘passionate about inclusion and accessibility in children’s literature.’ Adults needed protection too, because a similar operation was underway for Ian Fleming’s Bond novels. Everywhere, blue pencils were being sharpened. What next? Malraux’s cult of male virility? The 17th Earl of Oxford’s contempt for the lower orders? Kipling’s imperial paternalism? Elliot’s after-dinner anti-Semitism? Enid Blyton’s sexism?

The same considerations led to all the UK major newsagents being required to submit to Islam’s blasphemy laws by not stocking the special post-massacre issue of *Charlie Hebdo*, while the reward for brave independent newsagents who did was to be questioned by police as to the source of their supply *and the identities of those who bought it*. Comedians freely admit that to make jokes about Islam (and if ever there was a sitting target for satire and humour, it is Islam) is, in the words of one well-known comic, equivalent to writing a suicide note. Though the absurdities, rituals, claims and pretensions of Islam and the surreal antics of its devotees are wonderful material for satire, we can be sure that in the foreseeable future there will be no Ayatollah Ted or Imameess of Tower Hamlets.

Neither can Islam be depicted on the UK’s TV screens as it truly is, ‘red in tooth and claw’. Here, as always, a *dhimmi* BBC leads the way in its eagerness to comply with Muslim demands that their religion be depicted as one of peace, love and tolerance. That is why the BBC concocts story lines in its dramas that find Muslims almost always being on the receiving end of any religiously-inspired violence going, as in the 2008 series *Bonekickers*, in which a Christian fundamentalist is shown beheading a Muslim...as they do. Come the Islamic State, and viewers of YouTube, if they had the stomach for it, could watch exactly the reverse, only this time for real. Another BBC series, the spy drama *Spooks*, had the London Saudi Embassy seized by what at first viewers are led to suppose are Muslim Jihadis, but as the story unfolds, turn out to be not Muslims at all but...guess who? Of course, *Jews*, operatives of Mossad, the Israeli intelligence agency. There’s nothing like realism to lend credibility to a story line, as in one episode of the BBC’s long-running hospital drama series, *Casualty*. The original script had a young Muslim blowing himself up at a bus station. However, this this was vetoed, and the Muslim suicide bomber was transformed into a *kuffar* animal rights activist. Instances such as those I have described show a west grovelling on its knees before Islam, a west that would censor its greatest cultural achievements, and prefer not to create new ones, rather than risk giving offence to a religion that despises it.

22 You Must Do It

Whatever the relativists might say, there is a very straightforward and time-tested way to compare the merits of cultures, and that is by the movement of peoples between them. In the case of Islam, it is, save for ISIS volunteers, entirely in one direction...away from areas and countries where it holds sway, and by any means possible, even those that entail considerable risk to life, towards continents and countries where, as yet, it does not. And who can blame them? Some, a minority, are genuine asylum seekers, among them non-Muslims fleeing from Islamic persecution, and should be treated as such. Others, far more numerous, 70% at the very least, are economic migrants, seeking escape from the poverty that Islam everywhere either creates or is incapable of overcoming, except for a privileged few. In 2014, 219,000 arrived by sea on the coasts of southern Europe, most of them fleeing from the Jihadi-created chaos of Libya. Another 3,500 drowned en route. In April 2015, 950 drowned after an overloaded dinghy capsized. In one month alone, October 2015, the number of those *officially* registered as refugees reached 218,000, accompanied by more drownings. The flow continued and, so far as the UK was concerned, accelerated spectacularly. On December 31, 2021, 101,000 people were awaiting a UK Home Office decision on their application for asylum. As of August 2023, it had reached around 150,000. The number of asylum seekers crossing the English Channel from France (where, it should be said, they were already as safe as they would be in the UK, unlike when crossing the busiest shipping lane in the world in an overcrowded dinghy in mid-winter, in some cases with babies, young children and pregnant women on board) rose from less than a thousand in 2018 to 40,000 just up to the end of October 2022. Approximately 15,000 were from Albania, a 'safe' country.

A closer look Merkel's guests quickly dispels the belief of those who welcomed them that they were all asylum seekers fleeing the ravages of Islam's civil wars. These were confined to Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, Libya and Yemen. There were no such wars raging in Albania, Pakistan or Bangladesh or, apart from Libya, in the states of North and Central Africa also supplying a sizable proportion of those demanding the right to settle in Germany and Scandinavia. If these were fleeing families, why were over 70% of the migrants young men? Where were the old men, the women, the children? Those best suited physically to resist the despoiling of their homelands were fleeing, deserting those least able to protect themselves from the tender mercies of Jihadi rapists and executioners. Evidently, some young Muslim men only defend their 'honour' when it requires the murder of a raped or disobedient woman relative. And, just as was to be expected, the arrival these young Muslim men coincided, especially in Germany and Scandinavia, with a sudden increase in reported sexual assaults, including rapes. In the south west German state of Hesse, the sexual abuse of women and children *in refugee facilities* became so chronic that a women's rights group, *LandesFrauenRat*, made the mistake of reporting them on its website. However, within a matter of hours, the politically incorrect error of publicising the rape of Muslim women and children was rectified, and the offending item removed.

In the course of discussing the need for the allocation of quotas of migrants/refugees in proportion to each country's ability to absorb them, why did

politicians not request that Islamic states take up their fair share of the burden? Surely it would have made more sense to re-locate at least some Arab-speaking Muslims, who made up the majority of migrants, in neighbouring countries where they would have shared the same language and religion as their hosts? It would also have had the advantage of avoiding the perilous crossing of the Mediterranean in overcrowded and unseaworthy vessels, and at least reduce the exploitation of migrants by people-trafficking racketeers. Why did no-one with the authority to do so propose such an eminently sensible policy? Was it for fear of offending the oil rich despotisms of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf? And why did not a single Islamic state offer to exercise the compassion that their holy book commands to be shown to fellow Muslims? It was not for sure a matter of expense. Having ensured that by denying them sanctuary in his and the other oil rich kingdoms of the Saudi peninsula, all Muslim migrants were absorbed in the strategic heartlands of central and western Europe, King Salman was only too willing to accommodate their spiritual needs in Germany by funding the construction of 200 new Mosques to further his Kingdom's strategy of European Islamisation. Here again was the uniqueness of the Muslim diaspora. Unlike other migrated peoples who have made their permanent home in new lands, wherever Muslims take root, the overriding allegiance of the vast majority is to a faith, not their new homeland or even the one they or their forebears have left behind. The vast and still expanding Saudi global programme of mosque building and *madrassah* funding is designed to ensure that there will be no integration into the host society, a strategy greatly facilitated by the lunacies of official multiculturalism. Denying them sanctuary in Islamic states ensured that the millions of Muslims thus arriving in Europe would either be fed into already existing self-generated ghettos or be located in areas where they would over time create new ones. The inmates of these new Muslim enclaves, like those in the older ones, would then be expected to serve as foot soldiers in the global spread and final conquest of Islam, just as thousands of diaspora-bred young Muslims have as Jihadis for the Islamic State.

Amidst all the pious clamour of clerics and publicity-craving celebrities concerning Europe's duty to provide a new home for an unlimited number of Muslim migrants (so long as the home was not any of their own) it required a great deal of civic courage to say publicly that the crisis of the Islamic world was not of Europe's making, any more than Europe is able to provide the long-term remedy. The Muslims of north Africa, the Middle East and Asia have to learn, and quickly, that the flight of millions is not the answer to their countries' many and deep-seated problems,, and for the west to in any way encourage the delusion that it is merely postpones the adoption of the necessary solutions, which boil down to three, democracy, secularism and equal rights for women. In doing so, it has also created problems for their hosts that politicians and the mainstream media, for a variety of reasons, are reluctant to acknowledge and address. Research has proved beyond all doubt that among migrants, diaspora Muslims are far and away the group most likely to make the largest claims on the welfare system and engage in anti-social and criminal activities of various kinds, and at the same time, the least likely to pursue gainful employment and therefore to contribute to the funding of the economy and society as workers, tax payers and insurance contributors. A sudden increase in their number therefore only exacerbated problems that were already beginning to appear intractable. In the UK in the year 2012, compared to the national rate of 30%, 75% of Muslim women of working age were unemployed,

the vast majority of them we can be sure being those whose religion had confined them to their traditional role of child (preferably male) bearers and domestic slaves. That this state of affairs had little or nothing to do with racism was born out by a survey conducted by the Muslim reformist and integrationist Quilliam Foundation, which found that only 2% of Muslim women who were genuinely seeking work were unable to find it. It is also refuted by statistics which show that the unemployment rate for non-Muslim women with a similar Asian profile, mainly Hindus, Buddhists and Sikhs, is far closer to the national average. Therefore, the causes must lie elsewhere, in Islam's teachings on the status and role of women.

But while confinement to domestic servitude goes a long way to account for under-employment by Muslim women, it cannot explain however why 50% of Muslim men were also unemployed in the same year, while nationally the unemployment rate was less than one fifth of that figure. Taken together with the rate for Muslim women, this is nothing short of deliberate parasitism. The welfare system was and still being milked in other ways too. In 2002, 26% of Muslim women were claiming disability benefit and 21% of Muslim men, compared to the national average of 7%. Even the most zealous Islamophile would be hard put to see in these vast discrepancies the result of racial or any other prejudice. If anything, it suggests the contrary. A study conducted by University College London in 2013 showed that while immigrants from the European Economic Area to the UK (the EU plus Norway, Iceland and Lichtenstein) paid 34% more in taxes than they received in benefits (compared with UK nationals' 11%), in the period between 1995 to 2011, all immigrants combined still ran up a *deficit* of £114 billion. Given the statistics cited above, it does not take a mathematical genius to estimate who was mainly responsible generating that enormous deficit. In Germany, Muslim welfare dependency was if anything even more chronic. 80% of Turks of working age were unemployed and drawing benefits. In Denmark, Muslims comprise 5% of the total population, but draw 40% of the country's welfare benefits. With minor variations, the same pattern prevails throughout Western Europe. It was certain to be accentuated as more Muslim refugees, many, especially females, poorly educated if at all, and lacking language and other skills essential for employment, continued to find their way in huge numbers into a continent struggling to recover from a prolonged recession, followed by a pandemic and the shock waves to the world economy caused by Russian's invasion of Ukraine. No welfare system can indefinitely withstand these level of strain, given the demographic projections of Muslim diaspora birth rates and ever rising levels of institutionalised, *kuffar*-funded parasitism. And to make it clear to those who see in these judgements evidence of racism, I repeat, this is not a race issue, but one of a clash of cultures. A UK government survey conducted in 2002 showed that Muslims of subcontinental origin were four times more likely to be unemployed than Hindus from the same ethnic background.

At this point, let us remind ourselves once again how reluctant the world was to offer refuge to the tens of thousands of German Jews fleeing from Nazi persecution. What a contrast to the decade, beginning in 1944, when Europe, in many cases illegally, opened its doors to at least two million Muslims, a large proportion of whom, as studies have shown, are not genuine asylum seekers, and moreover, whose faith teaches them to hate their infidel hosts and even murder Jews. And how ironic that it is Germany which was the main destination of choice for most of the new arrivals. The estimated annual cost to Germany alone of accommodating

the basic needs of its migrants was 11 billion euros. How much wealth these migrants will generate is impossible to predict, but on past form it is certain not to remotely approach that sum, huge even by German standards. According to Germany's Labour Office, 80% of these new migrants had no skill qualifications whatsoever, with less than 10% likely to find employment of any kind in the first year of their stay. The cost to Germany was not only to be counted in money. Within days of the first migrant arrivals, reports began to appear in the German media of not only the rape of German women and the sexual abuse of children by Muslim migrants, but also of fighting, often by organised gangs, between Sunni and Shi'a Muslims, between Muslims from Asia and Arabs from the Middle East and north Africa, and Muslims of all persuasions against Kurds, Christians and Yazidis. (According to press reports, most the violence amongst migrants arriving in the UK is generated by Albanians on the run, one suspects not from Jihadis, but the police.) It was bound to happen. Here is a far from complete list of such incidents in September 2015:

- Hemer: Ten Algerian Muslims attacked a Christian couple from Eritrea with a glass bottle, because the man was wearing a cross.
- Fresing: A Christian family from Mosul were threatened by Muslims: 'They shouted at my wife and hit my child. They said "We will kill you and drink your blood"'. Sept. 13: Calden: 60 injured, including 10 children, in fighting between Pakistani and Syrian Muslims.
- Sept. 27: Calden: 700 Albanians fought a pitched battle with 70 Pakistanis, and then Pakistanis with Syrians. (There were no 'war zones' in either Albania or Pakistan, but one had been created in Calden)
- Sept. 29: Engelskirchen: Muslims from Algeria and Mali come to blows.
- Sept. 28: Dresden: Fighting between 150 Syrian and Pakistani Muslims.
- Aug. 10: Dresden: Fighting between Syrian and Afghan Muslims.
- Sept. 24: Leipzig: Fighting between around 100 Syrian and Afghan Muslims
- Sept. 2: Heidelberg: Fighting between Tunisian and Algerian Muslims.
- Sept. 29: Gerolzhofen: Fighting between rival gangs of Syrian Muslims.
- Sept. 1: Tegernsee: Fighting between Somali, Syrian and Albanian Muslims.

These clashes were either religious or ethnic, or sometimes even both. A convert to Christianity fleeing a probable death sentence for apostasy in Iran described his ordeal in a refugee camp in the heart of Europe: 'Muslims wake me before the crack of dawn during Ramadan and say I should eat before sunrise. When I decline, they call be a *kuffar*. They spit at me. They treat me like an animal. They threaten to kill me.' The head of Germany's police trade union, Rainer Wendt, described the mayhem that confronted his members in Germany's refugee centres:

We have been witnessing this violence for weeks and months. Groups based on ethnicity, religion or clan structures go after each other with knives and homemade weapons. When these groups fight each other at night, all those German citizens who welcomed the migrants with open arms at the Munich train station are fast asleep, but the police remain awake and are left standing in the middle. We can only estimate the true extent of violence because women and children are often afraid to file a complaint, since it is also about sexual abuse and rape. Sunnis are fighting Shiites; there are Salafists from competing groups. They are trying to impose their rules in the shelters. Christians are being massively oppressed and the Sharia is being enforced. Women are forced to cover up. Men are forced to pray.

Another confidential report, by German intelligence, found its way into the columns of *Welt Am Sonntag*:

The integration of hundreds of thousands of illegal migrants into German society is no longer possible in the light of the number of already existing parallel societies. We are importing Islamic extremism, Arab anti-Semitism, national and ethnic conflicts of other peoples, as well as a different understanding of society and law.

Those who might be inclined to dismiss such comments simply because they are made by a policeman or an intelligence officer should perhaps listen to Max Klinberg, Director of the Frankfurt-based International Society for Human Rights:

We have to dispense with the illusion that all of those coming here are human rights activists. Among those who arriving here now, a substantial number are at least as religiously intense as the Muslim Brotherhood. We are getting reports of threats of aggression, including threats of beheading [nothing unusual there] by Sunnis against Shiites, but Yazidis and Christians are the most impacted. Those Christian converts who do not hide their faith [this is in Germany!] stand a 100% probability of being attacked and mobbed.

Having seen what Merkel's illegal open-door policy had led to, the former SPD mayor of the Berlin district of Neukoln, Heinz Buschkowsky, concluded that 'the bulk of the migrants who are arriving here cannot be integrated'. Aware of the growing backlash against the negative - for ordinary Germans that is - consequences of Merkel's rash pledge that 'we can do it' (more honestly, 'you must do it'), her administration did what it could to prevent any information reaching the public that could fuel these discontents. For already by the beginning of October 2015, 51% of Germans polled said they were 'scared' of their country's new Muslim migrants. Given this percentage, such views cannot be dismissed as exclusively those of the far-right fringe.

Unlike the homelands of the migrants, Germany has a free press, and so, no doubt much to Merkel's frustration, confidential and classified reports on the anti-social activities of some Muslim migrants leaked their way into Germany's national dailies. *Bild* also revealed that the government had raised its estimate of new migrant arrivals for the year 2015 from 800,000 to 1.5 million. In the whole of 2014, the total number of registered migrant arrivals was 'only' 202,000. Ten months on, the UN estimated that in just one month, October 2015, 218,000 migrants had crossed to Europe by sea. But even if correct, the prediction of 1.5 million is far from the final figure, because under existing asylum laws (and all these migrants claimed to be asylum seekers) those who are granted asylum status are entitled to be joined by up to eight close family relatives. This is in addition to the approximately four million mainly Turkish Muslims already resident in Germany before the migrant surge began. On top of these numbers, an estimated 290,000 migrants entered Germany illegally. But not to worry. 'We can do it'. According to Uwe Brandt, President of the Bavarian Association of Municipalities, Germany was on course to become home to '20 million Muslims by 2020'. Even though this projection was wildly exaggerated, the rate of Germany's intake of Muslims was certain to have profound social, and political repercussions. Brandt continues:

A four-member refugee family receives up to 1,200 euros per month in transfer payments, plus [free] accommodation and meals. Now go to an unemployed German family man who has worked for 30 years, and now with is family receives only marginally more. These people are asking us whether we politicians really see this as fair and just.

On October 25, 2015, *Die Welt* published a portion of a document emanating from the very highest level of Germany's Intelligence and Security services. One of its conclusions was that the 'integration of hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants will be impossible given the large numbers involved and the already existing parallel Muslim societies in Germany.' Germany's internal security was also under threat:

We are importing Islamic extremism, Arab anti-Semitism, national and ethnic conflicts of other peoples, as well as different understanding of society and law...The high influx of people from other parts of the world will lead to the instability of our country. By allowing this mass migration, we are producing extremists. Mainstream society is radicalising because the majority does not want migration, which is being forced by the political elites. In the future, many Germans will turn away from the constitutional state.

It was not long before within her own party, the conservative Christian Democrats (CDU) and her coalition partners, the even more conservative Bavarian Social Union (CSU) and the centre-left Social Democrats (SPD), voices were raised against Chancellor Merkel's open-door policy. CDU Bundestag deputy Michael Stuebgen warned his party leader that his disagreement with her was 'fundamental': 'Our capacities are exhausted and there is concern that the system will explode if we do not regain control of our borders. But the Chancellor disagrees and so the conflict is unsolved.' Hans-Peter Friedrich of the CSU described Merkel's open-door policy as an 'unprecedented political blunder' that would have 'devastating long-term consequences.' It was 'totally irresponsible that tens of thousands of people are flowing into the country uncontrolled and unregistered, and we can only unreliably estimate exactly how many of them are Islamic State fighters or Islamic "sleepers". I am convinced that no other country in the world would be so naive and starry-eye to expose itself to such a risk.' With Sweden as a case in point, he was wrong. And it continued in Germany until SPD Chancellor Schulze announced the official termination of Merkel's 'open door' policy in March 2023. Vice Chancellor Sigmar Gabriel and Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, the two highest ranking SPD members of Merkel's administration, also broke ranks in a joint statement published by *Der Spiegel*, warning 'we cannot indefinitely absorb and integrate more than a million refugees a year', while the CSU's Bavarian Finance Minister, Markus Soeder demanded that 'there must be limits and quotas for immigration, we cannot save the whole world. The refugee influx will not be stopped unless we secure our borders and send a clear signal that not everyone can come to Germany.' But those advocating 'open borders' said they could. In densely-populated North Rhine Westphalia, those limits had already been reached. On October 21, 2015, 200 of the state's mayors signed an open letter to Merkel making it clear they could take no more migrants:

We are seriously concerned for our country and the cities and towns we represent. The reason: the massive and mostly uncontrolled flow of migrants to Germany and our cities and towns. All available housing possibilities are exhausted, including tents and shipping containers. Managing the migrant shelters is so time intensive that our personnel can no longer attend to other municipal responsibilities.

The mantra 'we can do it' had indeed become 'you must do it'. In fact, for those who would be required to sustain the financial costs...and worse...of her illegal invitation, it always had been. Understaffed police forces already struggling to cope as a result of Merkel's 'austerity' budget cuts were being overwhelmed as young male migrants spilled out from their emergency accommodation onto the streets of Germany's cities. According to Norman Grossmann, Director of Hamburg's Police Inspector's Office, of 55 purses snatched in the city each day, 90% were stolen by males between the ages of 20 and 30 from North Africa and the Balkans (sic). In Stuttgart, gangs of Gambians (Gambia is nearly 6,000 kilometres distant from Syria) had taken control of the city's drug trafficking. In Dresden, the same trade was plied quite openly at the city's main railway station by migrants from Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, again where there were no civil wars to generate genuine asylum seekers.

In Berlin, a classified police report leaked to *Bild* revealed that a dozen or so Arab clans exerted control over the German capital's underworld...the new Muslim Mafia, or 'Mufia'. Another police report leaked to *Der Tagesspiegel* documented evidence that 80% of violent crimes in Berlin were committed by non-Germans. And so it went on. In Duisburg, the most Islamised city in Germany, with 60,000 Muslims out of total population of 500,000, *Der Spiegel* described districts where 'immigrant gangs are taking over metro trains for themselves. Native residents and business people are being intimidated and silenced. People taking trams during the evening and night time describe their experiences as "living nightmares".'

The consequences of Merkel's grand gesture for 'ordinary', mainly working class Germans can in some respects be reduced to simple arithmetic. Germany is ranked 58th in the world for population density, twice of that of France and the highest of continental Europe's larger states. Merkel nevertheless believed that her heavily urbanised and densely populated country was capable of absorbing several million migrants steeped in a totally alien and to a large degree, incompatible culture, speaking totally different languages, reading, when they are literate, totally different scripts, reared in a faith that commands them not to make friends with unbelievers, and divided amongst themselves into hostile clans, nations and Islamic factions, all without any serious adverse impact on Germany's economic, social and political equilibrium, or the everyday lives of its host population.

Calden is a small town in the state of Hesse in central Germany, with a population of 7,500. The powers that be in Berlin decided that Calden had to accommodate 1,400 migrants. With typical Germany efficiency, a tent city was erected at a nearby airport. Welcoming locals donated enough clothing to fill four garages. But no sooner were the migrants settled in than trouble began. An argument in a food queue between an Albanian and a Pakistani, neither being from a country afflicted by civil war, escalated into a full-scale battle between 300 migrants from rival gangs armed with metal bars and pepper sprays. It took 500 police all night to restore order, three being injured in the fighting. The same locals who had gone out of their way to welcome and help the migrants now expressed their disillusionment

to reporters. But what did they expect? Sumte, a village in Lower Saxony, North West Germany, had an aging population of just 102 but was ordered to accommodate *10 times* that number of migrants. When the locals objected, their quota was reduced from 1000 to...750. In no time, the village's sewage system became clogged...something unheard of in hygiene-conscious Germany.

As in other European countries, attempts were made in Germany to conceal the extent of migrant criminality and anti-social behaviour, by doctoring or suppressing crime statistics and even by changing the names of criminals. (A convicted Muslim rapist from Somalia was identified in the press as 'Joseph T' instead of Ali S.) As it had been the practice in ultra-politically correct Sweden for a decade and more, so it was now in Germany. The head of the Association of Criminal Police, Andre Schulz, revealed that around 90% of sex crimes committed in 2014 did not appear in the official crime statistics because of the identity of the guilty parties. Based on information that had been kept from the public, Schultz warned that with at least 10% of Germany's migrants already involved in crime, Germany's traditionally low crime rate was set to soar to spectacular levels, which in fact proved to be the case. Even before the 2015 influx, according to Germany's Federal Police, crimes committed by asylum seekers rose from 32,495 in 2013 to 53,890 in 2014, an unprecedented increase. Violent crimes causing injury also rose at a similar rate in the same period from 5,172 to 8,994. With Jews, gays and young women especially in mind, it was not unreasonable to anticipate that not only Germany, but Europe, could be in for a bumpy ride. But fear not. 'We can do it'. When Chancellor Merkel was challenged at a public question and answer event to explain how she intended to combat potential threats to Germany's cultural identity, stability and internal security posed by the arrival of more than one million Muslim migrants, this is, in part, how she responded.

I think first and foremost that Islamism and Islamic terror, [surely a slip of the tongue] is a phenomenon predominately operating in Syria, Libya and northern Iraq, and to which, unfortunately, the European Union has contributed a myriad of fighters as well, and therefore we cannot sit there and say this phenomenon has nothing to do with us, because those are people, sometimes very young people, who grew up in our countries, and this is where we also bear a responsibility.

Jihadism also *Europe's* responsibility? Jihadi Islam is in no sense a creation of the European Union, though the EU certainly appeases it. It is integral to, and as old as Islam itself, and those Muslims who leave Europe to fight for the Islamic State are sworn enemies of everything modern Europe stands for. And Merkel's security services would surely have told her that Germany's Jihadis are reared in Muslim families, brain-washed in mosques, and recruited on Islamic State websites. Merkel continued: 'Secondly, fear has never been a good adviser. Neither in our personal lives nor in society.' Easily said, for someone permanently protected by a team of between 15 and 20 bodyguards. A little more than a year later, after an escalating series of sex crimes and murders perpetrated by her guests, events had compelled her to admit in her New Year's message that the main task facing her country was combatting the threat of 'Islamist terrorism' that her illegal migrant policy had generated, Merkel continued:

I see that there are these worries, but I have to say that we all have these chances and all these liberties to practice our own religion as well, in so far as we are practising it and believe in it. We should have the courage as Christians to enter a dialogue [Muslim 'dialogues' with Christians can often end with decapitation or crucifixion] and while we are talking about tradition [nobody was], maybe please go to church every once in a while, or become a tad more versed in the Bible and maybe be able just to explain a painting in a church or at least be able to explain what the meaning of Pentecost is. So I just have to say that a lot of people's knowledge about the Christian occident leaves a lot to be desired.

Desired by whom exactly? By degrees, although none too subtly, Merkel had moved the debate from one about cultural friction and threats to security to pastoral hectoring, theological debates, and irate exhortations for more Bible study, appreciation of liturgical art and knowledge of the Christian calendar. But there was more. It would seem this public decline of interest in Merkel's own faith (60% of Berliners are atheists) had resulted in far too many Germans being put to shame by superior Muslim exegesis: 'But then to come back and complain about how Muslims know much more about the *Koran* than they [i.e., Germans] do about the Bible, I find that very curious.' So do I her assumption that Germans felt shamed by the theological prowess of their Merkel's guests. Most Muslims are illiterate, and most of those who are not cannot read Arabic. I suggest that instead of exhorting Germans to study the Bible, Merkel would have been well-advised to recommend to her fellow Germans that they read the *Koran*, where they would have found all the evidence they needed to predict what kind of future faced their country, and indeed the rest of Europe, if it continued to allow millions of Muslim migrants to pour unchecked through their Chancellor's ever-open door. In the light of her flagrant breach of her own and European Union immigration and asylum regulations, there was no more fitting place for Merkel to begin her own study of the *Koran* than Verse 101 of Chapter Four: 'And who emigrates from his country in the way of Allah will find in the earth an abundant place of refuge and plentifulness'... in the welfare states of Germany, Scandinavia and the United Kingdom. Finally, when Merkel returned to the question she had been evading for the best part of her reply, it was to play the guilt card. Up to this point, her evasions had been puerile to be sure, eccentric even, but not immoral. But this is exactly what they now became. Those Germans responsible for the crimes of the Third Reich are for the most part long gone; many having spent their last years in the service of Jew-hating Muslim regimes. So unless a Biblical, 'lapsarian' political guilt can be passed down through the generations, that to paraphrase St Paul (Romans 5:2), 'in Hitler all Germans have sinned', Germany today has no more reason to feel guilty about the Holocaust or any other crimes of the Nazi era than the descendants of its victims. This is so obviously true, it should not need be stated. But here we have Merkel saying something rather different:

But let us not forget how just how rich European history is of dramatic and gruesome conflict and war. We should be really careful when we complain if somewhere else [sic] something bad [sic] is happening. Sure, we have to stand up against that, but we have no ground to stand on, to show haughty arrogance towards others. And I have to say that as Chancellor of Germany.

There we have it, again, the Chomsky principle, adapted by Merkel to apply to Germany's migrant crisis. Even the mildest criticism of Islam, and the deeds of those who subscribe to it, is *verboten*. We Germans have no right to be 'haughty' about the behaviour of some Muslim migrants no matter how 'bad' we may think it is. 'We have no ground to stand on', because seventy years and more ago, Germans committed unspeakable crimes, crimes, it must said, not only applauded but aided and abetted by prominent Muslim leaders. (See Chapter 6) Therefore, only he who is without ancestral sin can cast the first stone. But as it does with Chomsky, this rule only operates in one direction. Muslims can speak their home truths about the West's decadent, materialist, godless ways. But woe betide any German who has the temerity, or 'haughty arrogance' to reply in kind, because Germans, hereditary sinners that they all are, have 'no ground to stand on', whereas the followers of Islam, many of whose ancestors would have waged a holy war against the west for the best part of fourteen centuries, and whose descendants were still committing at that very moment the most appalling atrocities against not only infidels, including those of Merkel's faith, but those of their own, apparently did. One final thought. If I were one of that rare breed of men, a Jew in Germany, I would be doing what tens of thousands of Jews in France had already done. I would have been packing my bags and heading for Israel. I would not want to run the risk of having as my neighbours potentially violent young men whose religion commands them to regard Jews, as once did the Nazis, as sub-humans, in this case, to be precise, as 'apes and swine'.

What happened to Germany, even if sometimes on a lesser scale, also proved be the lot of other countries whose governments allowed uncontrolled entry by new Muslim migrants (as distinct from genuine asylum seekers), as proved to be the case in Sweden. The UK, with its official multicultural encouragement and rewarding of Muslim segregation in the name of 'celebrating diversity' (for example, with publicly fudged Sharia Courts, Muslim-only schools and sports facilities, *halal*-only canteens, un-investigated and un-prosecuted child and forced marriages, bigamy, benefits rackets, gang rape, FGM and honour killings), had already proved itself to be no exception to the rule. Why should the newcomers be any different from those who preceded them, and who have had years, decades in many cases to integrate but, as even some Muslim commentators themselves have complained, have quite deliberately chosen not to do so?

To put it bluntly, like the bogus asylum-seekers heading for continental Europe amidst a smaller number of genuine refugees, a substantial proportion of the existing Muslim population of the UK sees the welfare state as an Allah-given opportunity for free loading, and there is no reason to suppose that new arrivals will behave differently until they are required to do so. So one can see how some UK Muslims have cynically, but with some justice, described the welfare state as the modern voluntary version of the Sharia-sanctioned plunder of infidels, a *dhimmi* tax on the host *kuffar*. British Jihadi preacher and benefits parasite Anjem Choudary, who was himself until his conviction and imprisonment in 2016 on terrorist charges a long-standing benefit recipient to the sum of £32,000 per year, has described what is technically called the job seekers allowance as the 'Jihad Seeker's Allowance': 'You *kuffar* work. Give us the money. *Allahu Akhbar* [God is Great] We take the money'. And that is exactly what they do, making the British possibly the first voluntary *dhimmi*s in the history of Islam.

Those politicians, from left to right, who speak glibly of the 'enormous contributions' Islam makes to British society, always without being able to provide any examples, would do well to consult the statistics presented above before making such claims. (See Appendix X for sceptical Muslim views on these 'contributions') They prove that in a number of crucial ways, the 'enormous contributions' are in the opposite direction. But there is more. Wherever they have settled, far too many Muslims have brought with them a propensity for criminal behaviour, particularly offences related to terrorism, drugs, violence against Jews and the sexual abuse and exploitation of non-Muslim girls (see Chapter 27), and what is more, all on a level far above that of all other immigrant communities.

Even allowing for the possibility of discriminatory sentencing, that alone cannot explain the enormous disproportion of Muslims in the prison population of the UK, 15%, compared with only 4.8 % in the population as a whole, or France, where the Muslim prison population is a staggering 70% compared with ten percent in the country as a whole. In Spain, the proportion is again 70%, compared with only 2.3% in the total population. In Norway, it is 30%, Denmark, 20%, Belgium, 16%, Italy, 13%, in each case, far in excess of the share of Muslims in the total population, and what is even more to the point, *of any similar ethnic minority*. Small wonder then that in every opinion poll conducted on the subject, and what is more, in defiance of what their political representatives say to the contrary, large majorities of respondents, irrespective of their voting preferences, have found Islam to be incompatible with their beliefs and way of life, and want an end to illegal mass Muslim migration into Europe. Are they all Nazis for doing so?

Though it will be denounced as racist, despite the subject being the effect of religion and not genes on human behaviour, one should be free, without fear of prosecution, publicly to ask and seek answers to this question: How does it come about that Islam, whose notion of justice, being divine, is supposedly infinitely superior to any man-made system of ethics and law, rears men who, wherever they settle, prove themselves to be the most depraved and criminal on our planet? Why is it that 26% of prisoners in London are Muslims, while Muslims make up only 12%, of London's population? Why is it that the number of Muslim prisoners in the UK has *doubled* in ten years, while the UK's adult male Muslim population has increased by far less, and the total prison population by no more than ten per cent? Let us again discount racial factors. Taking the year 2012, Hindus comprised 1.0% of the UK population aged over 15, but only 0.5% of the prison population. With Sikhs, the percentages were 0.9 and 0.7, again *underrepresented*. Muslims however, who made up 4.0% of the UK's over 15 population, constituted 13.1% of the UK prison population, more than three times over-represented as compared with the UK as a whole, and *six* times more so than the no less 'Asian' Hindus. So what has this to do with race? Based exclusively on facts, figures and numerous surveys and studies that are all easily accessible, we can construct a partial, but still informative profile of the UK Muslim adult male. Of course, far from all Muslims conform to it, but nevertheless, when compared to the rest of the UK population as defined by religion, he is statistically more likely, in some cases much more likely to be:

in prison (Muslims in prisons in England and Wales rose from 5502 in 2002 to 1225 in December 2014);

a convicted terrorist (as of March 2016, 137 of 147 prisoners serving sentences for terrorism offences were known to be Muslims);

a supporter of terrorism;
an anti-semite;
a believer in (usually Jewish) conspiracies;
a gang rapist;
a pimp;
unemployed;
receiving disability benefit;
married to a much younger close relative;
to have sanctioned the mutilation of his female child or children.

Unelected Muslim ‘community’ spokesmen and Sharia leftists, and we can be sure not they alone, without being able to disprove the facts upon which this profile rests, will object that this is racist stereotyping, even though it is the profile of those who share not a race, but a belief. Consider the following: It is a proven fact that if those who do not believe smoking is harmful to health act on that belief by smoking, they will on average not live as long as those who act on the belief that it is. Likewise, the medical records of 5,558 Christian Scientists have shown that those who on principle refuse conventional medical treatment of any kind are more likely to die younger than those that do not. And such has also been the experience of medical teams working among African tribes in sometimes futile attempts to combat the pernicious influence of witch doctors. In each example, a belief, not genes, leads to certain predictable consequences. In fact, it would be strange in the extreme if it did not. And yet when the same is said of the effect of another belief, Islam, for example with respect to terrorist or sexual crimes, the same reasoning is condemned as racist.

If Muslims want to be treated like everybody else, they should, at least with respect to the law, behave like everybody else. But far too many do not. It is the same socially. Of all the disparate national and religious groups that make up the population of Europe, it is Muslims who are the ones most likely to take, legally or otherwise, and the least likely to give, just as they are the least likely to obey the laws of the land, but are the only ones to demand that they be replaced by their own. Unless there is a radical and rapid shift away from this imbalance to the point where Muslims pay their way and respect the laws of their hosts like nearly everybody else, more Muslim immigration could bleed Europe's welfare states white. In fact, as the figures quoted above indicate, it is already in danger of doing so. It will then become a matter of right-wing parties advancing policies of xenophobia and a *sauf qui peut* welfare privatisation based upon ‘fiscal responsibility’. What is beyond dispute is that Europe's welfare states, from which its peoples have gained such immense benefits, are now at risk from causes that originate, not in any inherent faults in European society, but the crisis of Islam, the consequences of which we have allowed to be imported into our own midst. As a result, parts of Europe now face one of the greatest challenges to their social and political stability since the defeat of Nazism and the collapse of the Soviet empire.

23 Holy Hitmen

The history of the last century has furnished ample evidence that for all his insights, Marx was certainly over-optimistic, not only about the prospects for socialism, which thus far have proved to be illusory, but even for the global ascendancy of western bourgeois civilisation as he understood it, which he predicted and indeed celebrated in the *Communist Manifesto*. Vast swathes of humanity still endure wretched lives outside its orbit *because* they are outside its orbit. And it is certainly the case that those parts that are in the grip of Islam have been the most resistant to the modernising influences and inroads of western 'bourgeois' civilisation, this being, ironically, one of its several aspects that favourably impresses the Sharia left. Contrast Pakistan, an Islamic hell hole masquerading as a country, with Japan, until the rise of post-Maoist China, the economic power house of the Far East, and with South Korea, Singapore, Thailand or even with its hated secular and democratic neighbour, India, whose GDP per capita is double that of Pakistan's. The example of Japan is perhaps the most interesting and instructive, because here was a nation whose feudal and masculine militarist culture most closely resembled that of Middle Eastern Islam, with its all-pervading Samurai cult of the warrior, and of its most extreme incarnation, the suicide (flying) bomber, the *kamikaze*. (The only other remotely comparable non-Islamic military martyrdom of modern times was that of the 3,000 German student volunteers who on November 10, 1914, were mowed down as, singing their student songs, they marched into a hail of gun fire in the battle of Langemark in Belgium...the so-called '*Kindermord*').

Religious fanaticism, the fusion of faith and state in the person of the divine Emperor, a disdain for the pleasures of this world and yet an unshakable belief in Japan's mission to conquer and rule it, hatred and contempt for, combined with fear of the outsider, an extreme misogyny, an indifference to suffering and the rights of the individual, a rejection of democracy but a readiness to harness western technology to fight its creators, a joyous acceptance of the duty to embrace death in pursuit of a transcendent cause and yes, even down to executions by beheading with a sword...we could here be describing the culture produced by the religion of peace.

Yet once Japan, like Germany, learned the hard, and it would seem in some cases, as with Islam, the only way that the dream of world conquest is not only just that, but that it brings down upon those who attempt to make it a reality the most terrible retribution, the USA was able, in but a few years, to transplant, literally at gun point, much of its own democratic political system and principles, and later certain features of its culture, into the far from receptive soil of a nation steeped in centuries of, if Professor Said will permit, an oriental warrior despotism. True, even today, Japan is nowhere near being a carbon copy of the USA. How could, and why should it be? But it does conduct its affairs in accordance with the same basic principles that it shares with the rest of the civilised world. Only a matter of decades ago, its people were among the most fanatically devout on the planet, millions being only too willing to die for their divine emperor if he so wished it, yet in 2012, the Japanese were ranked as the least pious in a survey that asked people in a range of countries (but significantly none of them Islamic) the simple question, 'are you certain god exists'? In Japan, only 4.3% of those asked replied 'yes'. In a survey confined to the UK, 90% of Muslims gave the same answer. We can be reasonably

sure that similar results would have been obtained not only in the entire diaspora, but Muslims everywhere. And looking at the chaos and carnage unleashed in the world of Islam today, driving millions of its devotees to seek sanctuary and hopefully a new life in the lands of the despised *kuffar*, we can truthfully say, much good has their credulity done them.

This seemingly unshakable grip of religion on the minds of the world's Muslims, blocking access to so many of the achievements of modern thought, surely helps us to understand why, in contrast to the US occupation of Japan, the western invasion, conquest and colonisation of Muslim territories, for example the British in Islamic regions of pre-independence India (now Pakistan), the British Palestine mandate and the Sudan, the French in Syria, Lebanon and Saharan Africa, and most recently, the joint western invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, have all utterly failed, where it was attempted, to achieve a similar transplantation to that accomplished in post war Japan and in post-independence India. In the cases of post-occupation Iraq and Afghanistan, as soon as the west's back was turned, tribal-based Islamic Jihadis, like unruly schoolboys when teacher leaves the classroom, unleashed orgies of incredible savagery on each other, while politicians working within the post-occupation pluralist system established by western invaders reverted almost overnight to the corrupt ways and sectarian feuds of their predecessors. Like an organism resisting a life-threatening virus, Islam fights modernity, secularism, individual freedom and liberal democracy with every fibre of its being. Even Turkey, once celebrated in the west as proof of the contrary, is being led back towards a theocratic past Atatürk believed he had laid to rest. So while some countries in far and south east Asia either have already adopted, or are in the process of adopting not only the technological but also, in widely varying degrees, the cultural and political ingredients of western civilisation, most of the Islamic and especially the Arab world is firmly in the grip of a culture that except for its technology, fears modernity like the plague, and resists it with all the means at its disposal. Islam's ideal world lies not in Western present, but in the desert of seventh century Arabia.

A goodly part of our planet is ruled by three legal systems or their derivatives. Two have pagan origins, and have evolved into the wholly-secular Common Law and Code Napoleon. The third is theocratic, Sharia law. Common Law, with its trial by a lay jury of peers, and derived mainly from customs and precedent, is Germanic in origin, brought to England by pagan Anglo-Saxon and Viking invaders and subsequently codified, unified, and supplemented by English charters and Parliaments to be then, in the era of empire, re-exported around the globe, again by conquest and migration, where to this day, long after the English have departed, it still shapes the justice systems of two continents. An analogous process produced the legal system that dominates the European continent; the wholly statute law and professional jurors of the Code Napoleon. Its origins lie in the laws enacted by the Roman Senate of pagan Rome which were then, like the Anglo Saxon's Common Law, exported by conquest until all of western Europe lived by and under the same laws as the citizens of Rome...hence *Civus Romanus Sum*. The decline and then fragmentation of the western Roman empire under the impact of pagan Germanic invasions left in its wake a multitude of states, all nominally under the jurisdiction of what was known as the 'Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation', but in practice free to be governed as their rulers chose. As a consequence, Roman law in some regions of Europe became diluted, resulting in a hybrid of local systems

inherited or improvised by rulers both secular and clerical. Out of this debris left by declining Rome eventually emerged two centres of power, that of the Franks, founded in the west by Charlemagne, crowned Holy Roman Emperor by the Pope in 800 AD, and in the centre and south, but centuries later, the Austrian Hapsburgs who, by a variety of means, secured their repeated election to the progressively more titular same office.

After an interval of more than a thousand years following the fall of the (western) Roman empire, in which Europe lacked a single, unifying legal system, Roman law in new guise returned to Europe with the coming of the French Revolution. Drawing their inspiration, as in so many other things, from Republican Rome, and guided by Enlightenment rationalism, France's new rulers sought to give effect, in legal terms, to the revolution's maxims of liberty, equality and fraternity. The end result came to be known, after its chief legislator, as the Code Napoleon, a system of law that was not derived from past customs or religious texts but constructed anew on the foundation of the principle of universal natural rights, and codified in statute laws. It was this system of law that Napoleon imposed on all the territories that came under his rule. As with the English re-export of Common Law, it in most cases endured and thrived after Napoleon's armies had departed, having travelled from Rome, via Paris, to Europe and, like Common Law, via Europe's empires, to the world. Also in a similar way, starting in the Hejaz of what is now the kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the conquering armies of Islam imposed their language, Arabic, and system of what is now known as Sharia law. It too has endured. But unlike secular statute and Common law, and the Code Napoleon, since it claims for itself divine origin, Sharia law cannot be questioned, nullified or changed either by legislation. or, as in Common Law, amended by precedent, only interpreted. Being perfect, it is unreformable. To propose to reform or amend Sharia law in any way is therefore to challenge the will and purpose of its creator, Allah, who is all wise in all things, and is therefore to commit the ultimate capital crime of apostasy.

By contrast, Common Law and *Code Napoleon*, being secular, made by man for man, can be adapted to meet new needs, attitudes and situations, and right existing wrongs. Thus, in the 1960s, under a Labour government, Parliament changed or abolished UK laws on homosexuality, divorce, the death penalty and abortion, all in defiance of Biblical teaching and in most cases, in the teeth of clerical opposition. The 57-member Organisation of the Islamic Conference makes no secret of the gulf that separates the Islamic concept of law from that prevailing in civilised countries. In doing so, it is simply applying the axiom which commands that Muslims must defy any man-made law which does not accord with the laws of Allah: '...fear not men but Me; and barter not my signs for a paltry price. And whoso judges not by that which Allah has sent down, these it is who are the disbelievers.' (*Koran*: 5: 45) A saying of the Prophet cited by Bukhari elaborates on this: 'A Muslim has to listen to and obey the order of his ruler whether he likes it or not, as long as its orders involve not one in disobedience to Allah. But if an act of disobedience to Allah is imposed, one should not listen to it or obey it.' (Bukhari, Volume 9, Book 89, *Hadith* 258) Should there then be any surprise that when polled on the subject, almost invariably a majority of diaspora Muslims favour the adoption of Sharia law and, as in the UK, in a variety of cases, prefer to have recourse to Sharia courts? But here too, double standards obtain. Self-appointed 'Muslim community' leaders, in accordance with the sanction afforded by Bukhari, are only too happy to use the

parliaments and courts of the *kuffar* to seek privileges and special protection for their faith. This is also the case internationally. As we have seen, Islamic states repeatedly accuse Israel at the UN of violating the same human rights they neither observe nor believe in. Under the terms of the Cairo Declaration of 1990, 'all men' (not 'all men and women', as specified in the Preamble to the UN Declaration) are held to be equal only 'in terms of basic [sic] human dignity', whatever they may be taken to mean, not their rights. Reading on, we then learn that such rights as the Declaration does grant are circumscribed by Sharia law. Being subordinate, as the *Koran* stipulates, to men, women are given their 'own rights to enjoy [sic]' and 'duties to perform', some of which we have already explored in some detail. Article 10 denies the right of non-Muslims to persuade Muslims to 'convert to another religion or atheism', while naturally not forbidding the reverse. This is because 'Islam is the religion of unspoiled nature'. Article 19 forbids any punishments for crimes other than those specified by Sharia law which, as we should all know by now, include amputation, stoning, crucifixion, flogging, and decapitation and, according to some authorities, burning alive.

As one would expect, given the constant clamour of diaspora Muslim pressure groups and their Sharia left stooges for ever tighter curbs on what can be said in public about Islam, free speech gets short shrift in the Declaration. Article 22(b) explains what is meant by the often demanded but rarely defined 'responsible' free speech: 'Everyone shall have the right to advocate what is right, and propagate what is good, and warn against what is wrong and evil according to the norms of Islamic Sharia'. It would have been simpler, and more honest, if this clause read: 'You can say what you like, as long it accords with Sharia law'. Or, as Henry Ford once said of his first mass produced model, 'you can have any colour you like, so long as it is black'. So here we have all the evidence we need as to why Islam not only cannot 'adjust' to the modern world, but does not even think it should, and in an alien, secular setting, why its diaspora finds it so hard, when it is encouraged to do so, to integrate into the host society, not least, its legal system.

The secular foundations and principles of the western world, which at least pays lip service to free speech, and with its human-made laws, treats women as equals and allows people to change their religion or have none at all, are ones that both the majority of existing diaspora Muslims, and even more so, those new millions who cascaded northward from the 'soft underbelly' of southern Europe, not only reject, but for religious and cultural reasons, simply cannot comprehend. True, more astute 'establishment' Muslims gladly exploit the opportunities the western political system offers them to pursue careers that are sometimes more corrupt than devout. But others far more influential among the young subscribe to a totally segregationist theocracy, a stance neatly captured by a poster displayed in the Sharia Borough of Tower Hamlets in the General Election of May 2015: 'Democracy is a system whereby man violates the right of Allah'.

Millions of Muslims have fled their homelands, some from danger, others simply to seek a better life. Yet no matter what the risks, all headed for the realm of the despised *kuffar*. How come? Could it be that the secret of what attracts them, the west's immense material superiority over the world of Islam, resides in what their culture and religion has denied them; the valuing and protecting of individual freedom? Over what is now nearly eight decades since the end of World War II, that portion of humanity which inhabits the civilised West has achieved probably the most radical and rapid political transformation in all human history, and

certainly since the Renaissance, the Reformation and the industrial and French revolutions. Beginning with the Allied defeat of the Axis powers, Europe has progressed, in a series of reforms and revolutions, from a continent dominated by totalitarianism of the left and right to one where liberal democracy prevails in all but its eastern, quasi Asianised hinterlands. The classic authoritarian regimes of central and South America have, with the exception of four supported by Jeremy Corbyn, those of Cuba, Venezuela, Nicaragua and Bolivia, suffered a similar fate. Excluding China, the majority of the remaining Asians live under political systems that, to one degree or another either embrace or pay lip service to the western model of democracy. Even sub-Saharan Africa has taken steps in the same direction, albeit modest and uncertain. Only where Islam rules is there, with few very partial exceptions for example, ex French Tunisia and Morocco and ex Dutch Indonesia, little or no progress. Instead, as proved to be the case with the 'Arab Spring', there is regression, either to theocracy or what still seems its only viable alternatives, authoritarian civilian or military rule...once again, Trotsky's 'hopeless rotations'

However, that is only part of the story. It is undeniably the case that the west's material progress has not only been caused, but matched to a large extent by the ascendancy of rational thought. Flatearthism, geocentrism, witches, alchemy, ouija boards, numerology, the 'paranormal', ghosts, unicorns, magic, palmistry, phrenology, astrology...these and similar fantasies are the objects of ridicule by any even only half-educated person...or at least they should be, for together with religion, they belong to the intellectual infancy of mankind. Only in one respect is the western mind trapped in its ancient past, even if to a lesser extent than its eastern counterpart, unable to free itself from one of the most primitive delusions ever to have to have afflicted the human brain, and for which there is not an iota of evidence; namely that there exists a conspiracy of the Jews, who comprise 0.2% of the world's population, to rule the remaining 99.8%.

Numerous surveys, some of which I have cited, prove that this belief is shared by substantial minorities of the populations of numerous highly educated countries. It is also a belief that knows no political boundaries. The reader might find this hard to credit, but as we shall see, many who believed in a world Jewish conspiracy joined the Labour Party to either vote for Jeremy Corbyn to be its Leader, or to support him after he was elected in 2015, proving that anti-Semitism, the creature of two ancient global monotheisms, not only endures but can in the minds of some even thrive like no other imbecility, seemingly unaffected by progress humanity has achieved in so many other spheres that require rational thought.

In the world of Islam, anti-Semitism is not, as it is in the West, one (no longer lethal) prejudice or stupidity among many, but an all-consuming, single-minded murderous obsession. It might be objected that at least an educated Arab must know that Hitler has gone down in history as the world's most spectacular loser, with his Third Reich in ruins, his dream of world conquest shattered, trapped like a rat in his Berlin bunker still cursing the Jews, then finally blowing out his diseased brain to escape capture and humiliation by the 'Jewish Bolshevik' Red Army coming up the road. Yet this monumental failure is the idol and exemplar of countless educated Muslims the world over, some of them respected politicians and clerics, not, obviously, because he lost his war against the rest of the world, but because he nearly won his war against the Jews - the completion of which, according to Livingstone's 'progressive voice for change', Yusef al-Qaradawi, 'will be all the work of the believers'. And so it goes on.

One would think that anyone concerned with the best interests of the Arab peoples, such as the far-left claims to be, would do their very utmost to loosen the grip of this self-defeating hatred on the Arab and Islamic mind. It should say, clearly, loudly and repeatedly, that Jew-hatred is not only ignorant and morally repugnant, but a dead end, not a cure for anything, but itself a disease that inflicts the most degrading and destructive consequences on those infected by it. It should say that even if Israel were, in the words of the former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, to be 'wiped off the map', and its every last Jewish inhabitant killed or even, as Corbyn's 'friends' Hezbollah and Hamas expressly desire, every Jew in the world, this would solve not a single one of the problems that beset the Islamic and, more specifically, the Arab world. It should say, these problems were and are not caused by either Israel or the Jews; any more than the Jews were responsible, as Hitler claimed, for Germany's defeat in the First World War and the failings of the Weimar Republic, but that they so obviously arise from within Arab society itself, re-enforced by its primitive Islamic culture. However, the Sharia left does not say this. Echoing the hate preachers of Jihadism, it says the exact opposite, that Israel is the enemy, and has to be destroyed so that the Arabs may prosper.

Contrary to the claims of the anti-Zionist left, the origins of the chronic current crisis of the Arab world not only predate western colonisation and the creation of the state of Israel. They have their roots in a centuries-old, religiously-derived and sustained culture that with fanatical tenacity and violence, obstructs progress towards modern, civilised ways of living. This was demonstrated in spectacular fashion by the demise of the so-called Arab Spring of 2010-12. Not accidentally, it followed the same sequence of events that accompanied the overthrow of the Shah in Iran in 1979. Fuelled by a pathological hatred and fear of secular modernity, in its wake swathes of the Middle East were hurled back not only decades but centuries. In Libya, al Qaeda and ISIS drove one third of the country's population into exile, while in Syria and Iraq, religious civil wars triggered by the terror of the ISIS Caliphate generated refugees by the million. After a brief interlude of theocratic Muslim Brotherhood rule in Egypt, a quasi-secular backlash returned the generals to power, who then in turn became the target for Muslim Brotherhood terrorism.

Cheered on by the western Sharia left, and with logistical and financial support from Qatar and Iran, terrorist, genocidal Hamas was elected to total power in the Gaza Strip while, with the full support of western politicians, oil companies and arms dealers, the grip of the feudal monarchies of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf, who promoted and funded Jihadi Islam, was as tight as ever. Even officially secular Turkey was heading towards theocracy. In so far as the Arab Spring set itself the goal of the democratisation of the Arab world, (and this is itself a moot point) it failed, and was doomed to fail because, as was the case in Iran after the overthrow of the Shah, despite the initial efforts of brave secular minorities, it succumbed to the numerically superior forces and deeper historical roots of Islamic theocracy. In such times of upheaval, the legions of Allah are always in the wings, awaiting their moment. The entirely predictable outcome of the Arab Spring, and with it, the resumption of the Islamic version of Trotsky's 'hopeless rotations', one between theocratic and semi-secular autocratic rule, surely demonstrates that the only way ahead for the Arab peoples is to end their obsession with Israel and the Jews, and to embrace the values and institutions that have served the west so well, and whose rejection has reduced the Arabs to their current pitiable state. And increasingly,

brave voices urging this can be heard in the Middle East, even amongst its Muslim clergy (See Appendix I)

Rather than challenge the lie that Israel and the Jews are the problem and the enemy, not the feudal, business, military, clerical and terrorist elites that exploit, oppress and manipulate the Arab masses, by endorsing a so-called 'militant Islamism', the *dhimmi* left justifies and panders to the very delusions that perpetuate the crisis of the region. In short, the anti-Zionist left has become the promoters of an Islamic version of Bebel's 'socialism of fools', an alchemy that can produce for the Arabs and especially the Palestinians only more attacks on and then defeats at the hands of Israel, which will then, as they have in the past, feed yet more intense feelings of hatred, frustration and humiliation. Those millions duped by Hitler's promise of a Jew-free 'Thousand Year Reich' realised far too late that whatever it might have inflicted on the Jews, his 'socialism of fools' had brought ruin, humiliation and moral disgrace to Germany. Now, in its new version, we have a 'Sharia Socialism', a racial and religious war of Muslims against Jews, a fulcrum of a broader war of east against west, an offensive we have not only witnessed on our streets, TV screens and in the press, but one that by deploying more subtle methods, including infiltration of the Labour Party and academe, has gained a foothold in the political mainstream.

One of the many ironies of leftist support for Islamic movements and pressure groups is the delusion that equipped with what it believes is its greater political sophistication, it will be the left and not its allies of convenience who will in time call the political tune, evidently unaware (let us be charitable) they are themselves being used as a convenient but none the less, dispensable ally and cover for the aims of their partners, aims which for sure, as the Hamas Covenant make very clear, do not include the creation of a society based on the teachings of an atheist Jew. How great, and indeed pathetic, are the delusions of the Sharia left in this respect can be measured by comparing its alliance with Islam to its historic precedents, when unlike today, its infidel partners were forces in their own right, not bankrupt opportunists in search of a new market for their out-dated wares. Long before the modest battalions of Corbyn and the Sharia left took to the field against Zionism and 'western imperialism', forces with a serious geopolitical clout, from the Bourbons and the Bolsheviks to the Third Reich and the CIA, had sought and some cases, consummated alliances with the legions of Allah. Even then, history provides numerous examples of the near-certainty that in all such combinations of convenience, when one of its partners has outlived its usefulness, it will be discarded and, if the weaker of the two, possibly worse.

Francis I of France, who reigned from 1515 to 1547, was constantly at odds and frequently at war with his great continental rival, the Hapsburg Empire. Realist that he was, he never allowed his formal adherence to the faith he shared with Spain and Austria to preclude a strategic alliance with the Islamic Ottoman empire, concluded in 1535 with Sultan Suleiman I. In the First World War, predominately protestant Imperial Germany, already aligned, like Francis I, with Ottoman Turkey, adopted a similar strategy by attempting to kindle an Islamic holy war against the British Empire amongst the Arabs of the Middle East and the Muslims of India. To this end, Kaiser William II proclaimed himself the protector of the world's Muslims, and authorised the construction of Germany's first Mosque in Berlin. The British Empire replied in kind, sending Lawrence on his successful mission to raise an Arab revolt in the Middle East against Germany's Turkish ally. In the Second World War,

Nazi Germany, playing not only the anti-British but the anti-Semitic card sought, and as we have seen, found willing allies in the Arab and Muslim worlds..

General Franco's victory in the Spanish Civil War relied heavily on the Roman Catholic Church for domestic political and 'spiritual' support, and on external military and logistic assistance from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. But in the first days of the conflict, Franco's putsch, lacking domestic popular support, was barely clinging on to its precarious toehold in the south of mainland Spain. With the navy, unlike most of the army, remaining loyal to the republic, Franco's survival was secured only with the aid of Muslim 'volunteers', eventually 87,000 in total, who were initially air-lifted from Spanish Morocco by German transport planes to the mainland, where they were set loose to commit appalling acts of brutality on republican civilians as well as on poorly armed workers and peasants. Following their conquest of Seville, Franco's Moors paraded through the city holding aloft in triumph on their bayonets as proof of their virility the underwear of the infidel woman they had gang-raped, Cologne and Rotherham fashion, as their 'spoils of war'. Symbolically, they were re-enacting in exactly the same location their invasion of Spain in the early eighth century, only now not as proud conquerors, but as the mercenaries of fascism. Then, in a leftist variant of the same strategy, we have the atheist and Jewish Comintern chief, Grigory Zinoviev, addressing a 'Congress of Toilers of the East' at Baku in 1920 (See Chapter 21), summoning Muslims to join with the Bolsheviks in a 'holy war' against the imperialist west, the first of a series of attempts to implement Lenin's newly-adopted 'eastern' strategy, in which the Soviet Union would be ranged on the side of the 'Oriental backward countries' against the 'most civilised countries', a strategy that as we have seen, was a total inversion of the progression anticipated by Karl Marx. Here we had the prototype, if not the consciously imitated model, of present-day Sharia leftism.

In the decades of the Cold War, as in the First, both sides sought and found allies in the Muslim world. The Middle East became a focus of Soviet strategy in the mid-1950s when, with the rise of Arab nationalism, post-Stalin leaders took a number of Arab dictatorships under their wings, notably those of Egypt, Iraq and Syria (each of which brutally repressed their domestic communist parties). Huge sums were spent on supplies of Soviet military hardware, all in the end to no avail, as it piled up in the desert as junk after a succession of Arab defeats at the hands of Israel's far smaller, but qualitatively vastly superior armed forces. Also during the Cold War, the USA and conservative Islamic politicians and clerics likewise arranged several marriages of convenience. The first was consummated in Iran when, in 1953, the Islamic clergy, spearheaded by the fanatical Fada'iyan-e Islam sect, collaborated with a CIA-backed monarchist coup that overthrew the left-nationalist government of Mohammad Mosaddegh, which was in the process of nationalising the country's foreign-owned oil industry. Next came Indonesia in 1965-66, in a similar operation that removed the communist-backed nationalist regime of President Sukharno. Finally, there was Afghanistan, where the US armed and trained Islamic forces fighting against the Soviet occupation, out of which, with the support of Pakistan, eventually emerged the Taliban.

Ignoring for a while the disapproval of the US, a greatly weakened post-war UK did its best to cling on to its imperial footholds in the Middle East, appeasing Arab monarchies and Islamic sentiment by its often quite brutal attempts to prevent Jewish settlement in what was then still the British Mandate. This strategy suffered a partial defeat with the creation of Israel in 1948, followed by the rise of a quasi-

secular Arab nationalism in Egypt, Syria and Iraq and the humiliation of the US-imposed withdrawal from Suez in 1956. But despite the ensuing official retreat from 'East of Suez' in the 1960s, the UK still pursued an Arabist strategy in a modified form, only now in junior partnership with the USA, while continuing its friendly relationships with the petro-Islamic despotisms of the Gulf monarchies and Saudi Arabia. Western dependence on Arab oil, and highly lucrative sales of military hardware, ensured that here, western protests concerning unspeakable violations of human rights were largely off the agenda.

As first Soviet and then US influence in the Middle East declined, Prime Minister and then President Jacques Chirac of France attempted a return to the failed 'third force' policy of De Gaulle. He too played the Arab card by exploiting Arab and Islamic hostility towards Israel, which his ambassador to the UK, Daniel Bernard, once described as a 'shitty little country'. Like Healy of the WRP, though on a scale that befitted a President of France, the venal Chirac courted Middle Eastern despots, among them Gaddafi of Libya, Syria's Hafaz al Assad and especially Saddam Hussein, for whom Chirac's predecessors had provided substantial technical assistance for the Iraqi dictator's bid to develop a nuclear arsenal specifically intended for use against Israel. Its demolition in 1981 by an Israeli air attack was condemned by a unanimous vote of the UN General Assembly, but we can be sure, was privately applauded by Iraq's neighbours. The final collapse of Chirac's 'third force' strategy came when he was obliged to endorse the UN approved and US-led invasion of Iraq to remove Saddam from power in 2003.

For as long as the Cold War continued, there was always the possibility for the West, principally the USA, of Islamic movements and regimes being enticed into common actions or even treaties designed to contain Soviet influence in the Arab world, and China's in the Far East. The US-orchestrated 1955 Baghdad Pact between Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Pakistan was one such example, and the CIA-engineered 1965 anti-communist coup in Indonesia, and US military support for the anti-Soviet resistance in Afghanistan, were two others. Perhaps the very success of these operations convinced their architects, more often than not devout Christians, that since Islam shared their hostility towards atheistic communism, it harboured no such feelings for western institutions and principles. In those now distant days of the first Cold War, there was no eulogising by US Presidents of Islam as a religion of peace, love and tolerance, any more than there was by Nazis in World War Two or Lawrence of Arabia in World War One. The more Indonesian or Iraqi commies Muslims killed, the better. According to State Department Intelligence officer of the time, Howard Federspiel, 'No-one cared, as long as they were communists that were being butchered.' Australia's conservative Prime Minister Harold Holt was equally sanguine: 'With 500,000 to one million [Indonesian] communist sympathisers knocked off [sic], I think it is safe to assume a reorientation has taken place'. There was however a problem that at the time was entirely overlooked. The assumption was that Islam could always be relied on to serve as a 'gun for hire', one that could be easily unloaded and safely locked away after the job was done. This proved to be a colossal miscalculation. With 9/11 and the Bali bombings of 2002, and this time not 'communist sympathisers' but nearly 3,000 US civilians and 88 Australian tourists 'knocked off', and Muslim terrorist attacks in Melbourne and Sydney, both the USA and Australia, together with the entire western world, found themselves confronted with an Islamic 'reorientation' that was once believed to be impossible. And yet towards the end of the cold war

there was a clear indication as to what might be coming. Hezbollah's Charter of 1985 explained how the Jihadist movement was waging a war on two fronts. Founded 'on the Holy *Koran*, the *sunnis* and the rulings of the *faqih*' (experts in Islamic law), it held that 'both capitalism and communism' were 'incapable of laying the foundations for a just society'. This was surely clear enough. 'Capitalism' by which was meant secular western democracy, was also the enemy, and with the demise of the Soviet bloc, it necessarily became the only enemy. Hence the alignment with it of the Sharia left. Despite these warnings, the possibility that Islam could turn on the West after the collapse of the USSR never seems to have been seriously considered by those charged with formulating its grand strategy. Even Iran's explicitly anti-US 'Islamic Revolution' and the Rushdie affair failed to compel a serious reappraisal of the West's relationship with Islam.

As the attacks mounted in frequency and scale, the fiction was still officially maintained that the 'real,' but for all that always elusive Islam, meant the West no harm. It was now, as Islam turned on the West, that the mantra was put into circulation that the faith was 'a religion of peace', as if saying it could make it a reality. Perhaps policy makers were still in the grip of a Cold War era mentality, when Islam was amenable to joint action with the west against what was then seen as the overriding threats of Soviet expansionism and native leftist movements in the East. True, it had been and remained the case that Islam could but loathe atheistic communism or indeed any other leftist, secular movement or regime. This explains why Islam had in the past proved itself an invaluable and indeed indispensable ally for the most reactionary western interests against eastern leftist regimes and movements. But with the collapse of the Kremlin's empire and the absorption of its western provinces into NATO and the EU, the shared fears that forged the western alliance with Islam were no more, though Obama, even after 9/11, was unable to grasp this so obvious new reality, which was that in the 21st century, for Islam, the West, and only the West, is the enemy, and manning its front line was Israel, ironically, the country so many in the West love to hate.

So however often and loudly politicians proclaimed their respect for Islam as a religion of toleration and peace, it changed nothing. Respect was not enough. Islam means, and demands, *submission*. The Islamic world had and still has its own agendas, and it has no intention of allowing itself to be used or 'modernised' by the West. Until the infidel West either submits or converts to Islam, its war against the liberal, democratic, secular, infidel west will continue. Already its Jihadis have carried the battle to the world's urban centres...Munich, New York, Buenos Aires, Boston, Ottawa, Dallas, Copenhagen, Bombay, Jakarta, Kabul, Buenos Aires, London, Barcelona, Turku, Jerusalem, Baghdad, Moscow, Chattanooga, Sydney, Istanbul, Moscow St. Petersburg, Beslan, Amsterdam, Nairobi, Mogadishu, Volgograd, Melbourne, Manchester, Madrid, Brussels, Toulouse, Orlando, Budapest, Berlin, Paris...Nowhere is safe anywhere there is Islam. More attacks will follow (and have). Deny it as our statesmen may, the former 'bipolar' world of the cold war has become tripolar, involving the West in two confrontations, one with a reborn Russian imperialism, and the other, Jihadi Islam. And both history and recent events tells us an alliance of convenience between these two enemies of the West is not only a dire possibility. It became an actuality with the support Russia received from Shi'a Syria and Iran in the United Nations and Hezbollah Hamas and even its OPEC partner, Sunni Saudi Arabia, after its invasion of Ukraine in 2022. (See Appendix XIV)

The Sharia left's alliance with Jihadism is predicated on the conviction that Islam is an anti-imperialist force, and that organisations inspired by it, such as Hamas and Hezbollah, are in some way 'resistance' movements, simply fighting back against western, and in particular, Israeli aggression. This is nonsense, in the first place because Hamas and Hezbollah are not 'resisting' anyone, least of all Israel, but declare explicitly in their founding charters and subsequent statements that they seek its destruction, together with the murder of every Jew they can lay their hands on. (See last addendum) Secondly, Islam, the faith that inspires not only Hezbollah and Hamas, but every Jihadist movement, be it ISIS, Boko Haram, the Taliban, Islamic *Jihad*, al Shabaab or al Qaeda, is itself an imperialist doctrine and movement like no other in history. Having set itself the goal of nothing less than world conquest and domination, *Jihad* will continue until, as the *Koran* says, 'religion is all for Allah' (Chapter 8, Verse 39) As for the great empires of the West, the sun began to set on their colonial possessions at the end of the Second World War, and, like all their predecessors, have shrunk to little more than zero. Why does Islam still pursue its imperialist agenda when the West, whatever the Sharia left might say, has abandoned its own? And why, unlike its two rival monotheisms, has Islam thus far proved incapable of accommodating itself to liberal democracy, while seeking to create, again unlike Christianity and Judaism, movements, some relatively peaceful, others, violent, dedicated to its destruction? Is there something unique about the world from which Islam sprang that might help to explain why this is so? I have already explored this question in chapter 21, but it merits further examination.

While Europe's encounters with the East reach back to the time of ancient Greece in its wars with the Persians, it was only in the nineteenth century that the Orient became the subject of serious academic study. Those who conducted it quickly became aware that the social structures, culture, economy, politics and religions of the East had evolved along lines that were fundamentally different from those of Europe. Though they were the first to develop the essential elements of urban civilisation...centralised state power, literacy and numeracy, codified laws...from early on, each of these once most advanced civilisations stagnated, and were then overtaken, and in many cases easily conquered and colonised by a hitherto more backward Europe, rendered defenceless as a result of Trotsky's 'hopeless rotations'.

Following in the footsteps of Adam Smith, Hegel and both the Mills, Marx was convinced by his studies of the East (thereby earning for himself, as for his predecessors, Professor Said's designation as a racist 'Orientalist') that the distinguishing feature of all the oriental despotisms was 'the absence of [private] landed property', itself the result of the unique topography and climate of 'great stretches of desert extending from the Sahara right across Arabia, Persia and India and Tartary to the Asiatic uplands', these territories comprising what coincides to a remarkable and highly significant degree with what today is understood as the world of Islam. Here, 'climate and territorial conditions' had not only made 'artificial irrigation by canals waterworks the basis of Oriental agriculture' but required a despotic central power to regulate them. Centred on great rivers in the midst of deserts, such as the Nile, Tigris and Euphrates, administered by a literate caste of high priests and personified by its god king (or in Egypt also queen) the state, as the divinely ordained sole owner of all factors of production, extracted and allocated for its own purposes the economic surplus generated by centrally controlled

regulation and distribution of the water supply to the surrounding bonded peasantry, who worked on land likewise owned by the state. It was, in effect, a theocratic communism, which Marx described as a 'general slavery of the Orient', a 'barracks communism'. These and several other important features comprised what Marx designated as the 'Asiatic mode of production', and which set it apart from the stages of historical development which, in respect of Europe, he listed chronologically as primitive tribalism, based on communal land ownership, the slave system of classical antiquity, (Greece and Rome) then feudalism and capitalism.

Marx was especially intrigued by firstly, the 'Asiatic' mode's uniqueness, which also evolved out of primitive, tribal based communism, but unlike European slavery, retained its absence of individual private property and, secondly, by its static character, (yet again, Trotsky's 'hopeless rotations') which he contrasted with societies that although emerging much later in Europe, introduced the private ownership of the productive forces that made possible the subsequent transition from the classical slave mode via feudalism, to agrarian capitalism, with its private ownership of land, to industrial capitalism. As we have seen, up until the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917, Lenin not only subscribed to Marx's analysis and definition of Oriental society, but followed him in extending it, in certain respects, to tsarist Russia, which both Marx and Engels also defined as 'semi-Asiatic' with regard to its despotic political institutions and low level of culture, which were the inheritance from the 'Tartar yoke' imposed by the Mongols in earlier times. We have seen that with the failure of communist-led revolutions in the west, Lenin then discarded this 'orthodox' stance on the Orient, and in a complete reversal of his previous position, heralded the East as the vanguard of world socialism, here foreshadowing a similar evolution by his latter day epigones. The analysis of Orientalism was taken further by the German social scientist Max Weber and then more exhaustively again by Karl Wittfogel, who coined the term 'hydraulic societies', and adopted Marx's 'oriental despotism' to denote respectively their determining economic and political characteristics. All three focused on one essential and, for our purposes, highly relevant feature, the absence of an autonomous civil society and of any concept of the individual as belonging to him or herself, possessing rights as well as owing duties, such as emerged in the pagan civilisations of the West prior to the birth of Christianity. Christianity, with its emphasis also on the individual, took root and then flourished in a Graeco-Roman culture that had for centuries thrived on a civil society not only separate from but to a degree opposed to the state power, and with which the state eventually had to come to terms in the heydays of Greek and Roman democracy. This separation of powers took another form under Christianity...render unto God as well as Caesar, as distinct from as with Islam, which renders unto to Allah alone. While the oriental despotism out of whose soil (or rather sand) Islam sprang knew no such distinction Both in Athens and Rome, the (free) individual had rights as well duties. Consequently the state was not all, and its gods were mere mortals writ large, flawed and fractious. A freeman could vote, stand for office, pray to any god he chose and even, like Lucretius, mock those who believed in them, and yet remain a respected citizen. Even today, the only freedom Islam recognises is the right to be either a Muslim or a *dhimmi*, while a thousand years before its birth, in Athens and Rome in their democratic prime, free citizens chose, challenged and removed their rulers in the city square and the Senate, cities where men made their own laws and no sacred text handed down or dictated by a god told them how to behave. Athens and Rome

gave us the oratory of Demosthenes and Cicero, the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, the plays of Euripides and Aristophanes, the poetry of Homer and Virgil, the histories of Thucydides and Herodotus, scientists who conceived of the atom, measured accurately the circumference of the earth and proved it went round the sun, while a thousand and more years later, Mohammed bequeathed to posterity a book whose author thought the earth was flat and the sun went round it, and preached terror against those who did not submit to its teachings.

It is not by accident that Rome coined the words republic, liberty, justice, citizen, tribune, Senate and forum, and the Greeks, philosophy, logic, drama, music, poetry, geometry, mathematics, politics, history, science and democracy, while the East gave the world the word *Islam*, the Arabic for submission, and the obligatory act of prostration before a tyrannical and vengeful god. Neither we will find in the ancient East representative institutions analogous to the Roman and Forum and Tribune or the Athenian Pnyx, Ecclesia and Agora, the guilds and estates of the feudal West, which served as the germ cells of modern trade unions and parliamentary democracy. Nor was it by chance or simply the whim of a power-hungry ruler that in the Orient there were no free citizens equivalent to those of Greece and Rome. The concept did not and, given the centrally regulated conditions of life, could not exist. The economic system that made life possible demanded that all human beings, like all material objects, including the water and the land that it irrigated, were the sole possessions of the state, personified by the god king, and that labour was subject to the needs of what was in effect a planned economy, as Marx says, a 'barracks communism', one totally geared to the cycle of the seasons and wholly dependent on the riparian water supply.

Only a despotic central power, such as evolved in Egypt under the pharaohs, in Mesopotamia, and around the great rivers of India and China, was capable of harnessing nature to supply both the essentials of life for its subjects and rulers and generate a surplus sufficient to meet the needs of external defence and conquest. As Marx puts it, 'the despot here appears as father of all the lesser communities, thus realising the common unity of all', which in Islam, evolved into the *Ummah*, the world-wide community of all believers, and which Obama either wilfully or foolishly mistook for the brotherhood of all mankind.

Once having achieved a certain internal equilibrium (although there was always the threat of conquest by similarly structured neighbouring states) stasis set in. In Marx's estimation, and he has largely been proved correct, states based on or substantially influenced by the Asiatic mode of production could only be dislodged from their socio-economic and political *cul de sacs* by the action upon them of societies technologically more advanced, either by conquest and colonisation, as in the case of India, trade, as with Japan and China, or a combination of both, as with Egypt and the Middle East. Marx, who in his life time welcomed this development as the only means of overcoming the Orient's economic backwardness and cultural insularity, explains why this was the case: 'The Asiatic form necessarily survives longest and most stubbornly. This is due to the fundamental principle on which it is based, that is that the individual does not become independent of the community, that the circle of production is self-sustaining.' Here there could be no question of the individual citizen with rights as well as duties inscribed in law. As Marx explains, individual freedom does not come either easily, cheaply or quickly, 'man is only individualised through the process of history. He originally appears as a generic being, a tribal being, a herd animal - though by no means a "political

animal" in the political sense'...an apt description of the *Ummah's* ideal 'Muslim man'. Here again, Marx is following, if not imitating Hegel, this time his *Philosophy of Right*. Like Islam, in which 'legislation is but for Allah' (*Koran*: 12: 40) the original oriental despotism, says Hegel, was 'theocratic', the ruler 'also a high priest [as with Caliph and Ayatollah] or God himself, while religious and moral commands, or usage rather, are at the same time natural and positive law [as with the Sharia]. In the magnificence of this regime as a whole, individual personality loses its rights and perishes' (just as Marx says), resulting in a society in which its 'inner calm is merely the calm of non-political life'. Hegel is here describing the ancient pre-Islamic East. But it could easily be today's Saudi Arabia. Further on in the same work, Hegel develops this point: 'Whereas under the despots of Asia the individual has no inner life and no justification in himself, in the modern [i.e., western] world, man insists on respect being paid to his inner life. [e.g., 'freedom of conscience', unknown in the doctrine and world of Islam.] The conjunction of duty and of right has a twofold aspect: what the state demands from us as a duty is *eo ipso* our right as individuals, since the [western] state is nothing but this articulation of the concept of freedom.' Magnificent.

For analogous reasons, neither was there a role or place for popular representation in the Orient such as we find in the west in the pre-Christian era, either in Germanic or classic form. The functions of decision making and matters concerning religious rites and doctrine were concentrated in the hands of the literate priestly caste and the supreme ruler and law giver, the oriental god king, a Sargon, Amenhotep, Darius or Hammurabi, just as they were with Islam, beginning with Mohammed and then his successors, the Caliphs.

In the west, a totally different economic system, based on decentralised private ownership, necessarily produced a no less fragmented society, in which classes, factions and parties competed in the attempt to curtail and even supplant the power of the monarchy and the hereditary ruling families. In Rome and Greece, this contest for power began in the early fifth century BC, culminating in the overthrow of monarchy, and its replacement by popular representation and decision making, the Tribune in Rome and the city assembly in Greece. In time, both Greece and Rome succumbed to imperial rule, Greece by conquest and Rome by the populist militarism of the first Caesars. But the old traditions died hard, as the contemporary historian Suetonius records:

[Caesar] Augustus's speeches in the House Senate would often be interrupted by such remarks as 'I don't understand you' or 'I'd dispute your point if I got the chance'. And it happened more than once that, exasperated by recriminations which lowered the tone of the debate, he left the house in an angry haste, and was followed by shouts of 'You ought to let Senators say exactly what they think about matters of public importance!'...

Yet Augustus, the first of the Caesars, never punished anyone for showing independence of mind on such occasions, or even for behaving insolently. Of his successor, Tiberius, it was said that he was 'quite unperturbed by abuse, slander or lampoons on himself and his family, and would often say that liberty to speak and think as one pleases is the test of a free country', which indeed it is, and one that all states ruled by Sharia law comprehensively fail, two thousand years on. Even in

tribal Germany, with its primitive rural peoples divided by dialects, rivers, forests and mountains that only under Bismarck achieved the semblance of a united nation, despotism was an alien institution. Justice was administered by a twelve-man jury and politics by tribal assemblies, the Hundred and the Witan, a system of law and self-government that with the migration to England of the Anglo-Saxons, became the seeds of the parliamentary democracy and legal system that govern the UK and many of its former colonies today. Pagan Greece, Rome, Germany...each in their own way gave birth to the foundations of what today the west understands as modern civilisation, and what Islam, with its unreformable Sharia law and 'legislation is not but for Allah', not only sees as alien, but as its enemy.

As the cultural successor to the despotic theocracies of the East, Islam, not only at home but in its diasporas, has largely succeeded, albeit with increasing difficulty for both political and technical reasons, in insulating itself from the dissolving contagions of democracy and individual freedom. Muslims are all born, and shall remain, as the often-cited happy mantra has it, 'slaves of Allah'. Neither in the *Koran* nor the *hadith* is there to be found the least hint that Allah, unlike the ancient Greeks and Romans and indeed the Bible, with its 'render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's', that is, the world of secular politics, considers his subjects fit to govern themselves or devise their own laws. In the Asiatic despotisms described by Marx and Hegel we can indeed recognise the prototype of its bastard offspring, the Islamic 'herd', the *Ummah*, that swallows up, homogenises and thus effectively erases the individual 'in the political sense'. Instead of the self-governing citizen, we have the subject, not even of an unchosen earthly power, but of Allah, out of which in their collectivity as raw human material is moulded the anything but 'vibrant' Muslim community. Frozen in time under an all-seeing and all-knowing deity, the *Ummah* is governed on Allah's behalf either by a theocratic clerical caste, as with Shi'a Islam (Iran), or with its Sunni versions, either by a monarch or an all-powerful Caliph (the Islamic State), all in accordance with an unchanging because unchangeable system of law which, again like its oriental progenitors, fuses state and faith. (See Ayatollah Khomeini's exposition of this system in Appendix G)

The only essential difference between the despotism of Islam and that actually operated by the ancient societies of the Middle East is economic, though even here there are also continuities. The system of tribute as it operated in the 'Asiatic mode', in which a proportion of the product of the labouring classes was extracted by the state to support the administrative caste of officials and clergy and their various undertakings, has its parallel in the rules governing the sharing out of 'booty', the 'spoils of war', both human and material, accumulated by Mohammed's raiding bands, of which one fifth fell to the prophet, who held it in trust, exactly in the manner of the oriental despots: 'Know that one fifth of all booty you take belongs to Allah, and to the messenger [sic], and for the near relatives [sic] of the messenger'. (*Koran*, Chapter 8, Verse 40) But the difference is an important one. Because Islam emerged from a desert region and not in the setting of a settled, riparian, urban-centred society based upon state ownership of property and the exploitation of bonded peasant labour, it evolved a tribal semi-nomadic bandit culture, initially situated in the riverless, barren north west of the Arabian Peninsula. Although lacking access to the fertile soils generated by the great rivers to its east and west, the one great asset the northern Hejaz possessed was its strategic location astride the ancient trade routes linking the three continents of Africa, Asia

and Europe. Consequently, when Mohammed and his band of followers left Mecca and headed north to Medina, they were able to sustain themselves by the parasitic practice of raiding caravans and the enslavement of captives. (See Appendix L) Only when a more stable Islamic society evolved in the wake of its conquest of more advanced cultures than its own could land thus conquered become transformed into crown property of the caliph or, again through conquest or grants from rich individuals, become the inviolate and permanent collective property of the clergy, the so called *Waqf*. This represented a similar evolution to that of Church and crown property in the west, but with the difference that with the advent of the Reformation, church lands and property were either simply appropriated by the Protestant landed classes, as in Germany and Scandinavia, or seized and sold off by the state back into private hands, as under England's Henry VIII. No such property secularisation has ever been sanctioned in the history of Islam or is it ever likely to while the clergy either wields or shares state power, as it does in Iran and Saudi Arabia. Significantly, it was the Shah of Iran's so-called 'White Revolution', which involved the transfer of clerical lands to peasant ownership, that caused the clergy to turn against the monarchy it had served faithfully down the centuries.

Clerical ownership, as for example with the vast holdings of the Catholic Church, since it excluded and crucially also necessarily exploited the laity, was not common ownership in the modern sense. It was not the sharing of 'all things common' of the Acts of the Apostles. It was a form of collective feudal exploitation by both the Christian and Islamic clergy of those who lived and worked on its lands. We have already noted that by contrast with the Bible, (see Chapter 16), while there is much talk in the *Koran* and *hadith* about the acquisition of booty and 'spoils', there is none about their common ownership. 'Militant Islamism' has nothing to do with 'social justice', but everything to do with purity of faith and the spreading to the ends of the earth of the rule of Allah, however the Sharia left and western commentators might try to portray it as in some sense 'radical' or revolutionary. Under the despotic rule of its absentee plutocrats, Gaza is one of the most unequal societies on planet earth. While the vast majority, including the tunnel diggers and cannon fodder, lived in poverty, with an unemployment rate approaching 50%, Hamas supremo Khaled Mashal 'hamased' a fortune of £2.5 billion, and his Number Two, Musa Abu Marzook, £2.3 billion. These were the 'friends' of Comrade Corbyn, billionaires whose Covenant denounces Corbyn's 'for the many, not the few' (which if applied in Gaza, would result in their expropriation) as the work of a world Jewish conspiracy. We will in due course encounter another Muslim billionaire engaged with Corbyn in the same anti-Zionist joint enterprise, only far closer to home.

Islamic plunder, conveniently sanctioned, as we have seen by the faith's holy texts, certainly shared some of the features of its counterparts in the west, for example the Muslim raiding of desert caravans and the piracy of Tudor freebooters, and the (always ignored) Muslim trans-Saharan and the Christian trans-Atlantic slave trades. But the economic results of such plunder helped to produce very different societies. In the west, what Marx described as the process of 'primitive capitalist accumulation', pursued at home, as with England's land clearances and enclosures, and abroad by slavery, plunder and theft, greatly helped generate the capital and financial reserves necessary for what economists call the 'take off' phase of modern capitalism. Yet even in the colonialist west, outcomes varied, depending on circumstances. Spain's looting of the New World vastly outstripped that of

England's, but the proceeds served mainly to satisfy the voracious appetites of its of its parasitic clergy and aristocracy. By contrast, a post-feudal England, protected by seas and therefore able to dispense with a standing army, with a Church now subservient to the state and stripped of much of its wealth by Henry's reforms, was ideally placed to harness the fruits of its plunder to economic gain and technological innovation. Islamic 'accumulation', conducted on no less grand a scale, like Spain's, produced no equivalent result to England's.... witness the abject economic state of the Arab and, more broadly, the Islamic world today. Instead of disturbing the equilibrium of the old order, plunder re-enforced it. As in the case of Spain, there was no 'take off', because its proceeds, rather than feeding technological innovation and economic growth, flowed into the hands of the clergy, the royal houses and the funding of yet more costly landed-based conquests and religious wars to sustain the rate of plunder. And unlike the original 'oriental' or 'hydraulic' despotism, which could rely on the labour of a sedentary captive peasant class to provide the essentials of life, the marauding bands of Mohammed and his successors relied almost entirely on plunder and conquest to furnish them.

This explains why the *Koran*, unlike the Bible, has nothing to say about work and thrift, but instead provides rules for the seizure and distribution of the fruits of infidel labour and of the bodies of those who performed it. The need to preserve at all costs such an order of things could not but generate an intense and, with Salafism, fanatical conservatism, a paralytic fear of contamination by the modernising and liberalising west, of anything that might disturb, dissolve and undermine the divinely ordained parasitic dystopia born of the seventh century Hejaz. The distinction also needs to be made that whereas the infidel nations of the west, at different times and by different methods, eventually abolished the iniquities of slavery, Islamic law to this day upholds them. True, slavery was abolished, at least officially, in Saudi Arabia in 1962, Oman in 1970 and Mauritania in 2007 (!!!), but only for it to be restored by UK Muslim pimps, and by Boko Haram and the Islamic State in the sexual enslavement ('that which the right hand possesses') of infidel girls. According to the Anti-Slavery Society, there are as many as nine million slaves in Africa even today, while the International Labour Office calculated in 2017 that 7 out of 1,000 Africans were slaves. And as in days of yore, this trade in human flesh was being conducted by Arab Muslims.

Today in the Middle East, the centrally regulated irrigation of river water that was the foundation of the economies and power of the ancient 'hydraulic societies' has been replaced by the extraction of oil. Thanks to infidel technology, long departed oriental despotisms have been reincarnated as petro-monarchies and theocracies. But, as with the slave trade, some things do not change. As in the time of the ancient Asiatic despotisms, eternal and all-encompassing laws still emanate from a god. They cannot be made by man. According to Islam, any system of law that is of human origin necessarily lacks all legitimacy and conforming to it in the *kuffar's* 'house of war' is simply a matter of temporary tactical convenience or necessity until such times as Sharia law rules supreme everywhere. Islam also inherited another feature of ancient times; the urge, and the necessity, to expand. Egypt, and Sumeria and its successor states - the Hittites, Assyrians, Persians and Babylonians - were rarely at peace with their neighbours, just as Islam from the very beginning sought to extend its rule, and the tribute that it brought, far beyond the place of its origin. Islam's expansion began in the life-time of its founder in the early seventh century, but at that stage, was confined to the Arabic speaking Hejaz.

His successors, though more often than not at war with each other as to the legitimacy of their claims, still found the time and resources to extend Islamic rule in every direction:

West, through the Levant and Egypt along the south coast of the Mediterranean as far as the Atlantic coast of Africa, and from there into Spain, and then Sicily, Crete, Sardinia and Corsica, (whence 'Corsair', originally a Muslim pirate) Cyprus and southern Italy, at the same time carrying out 'white' slaving raids as far afield as Iceland;

South, across the Sahara to equatorial Africa as far as what is now modern Nigeria, at the same time engaging in a slave trade on a scale vaster and no less iniquitous than that of the European powers.

East, beyond the Arabian Peninsula through Iran and Afghanistan to India and western China, and what is now modern Indonesia;

North east, via the Black Sea to what became, beyond the Urals, the Turkic speaking heartland of the sprawling 14th century Islamic empire of Timur ('the lame'), under whose despotic rule, and as a result of his endless military campaigning, 17 million deaths ensued;

Northwards, into Europe via Asia minor to Byzantium, Greece, the Balkans, Hungary and as far as the 'gates of Vienna'; and at the other end of Europe, from Morocco via Spain into France as far as the River Loire and even briefly reaching the upper Rhone valley in what is now modern-day Switzerland.

This sprawling, tri-continental realm of Islam was never ruled from a single centre, being divided between at least two, sometimes more, competing dynasties and caliphates, the most enduring being that of the 'Moorish' Emirate of Cordoba in the west and the Turkish Ottomans in the centre, both Sunni, while the Shi'a power centre, then as now, revolved around Persia in the east. But the great hope still endures that Sunni Islam will end the faith's divisions and, once united, restore a single caliphate that will conquer the entire world. Such was the dream and appeal of ISIS, and young men and women, not only in the Middle East, but from prosperous families in Europe, rallied to the call in their thousands.

Given this record of the creation by *Jihad* of the largest empire in all human history, it is hard to understand how western politicians can apologise for Christian resistance to its expansion in the Crusades, while at the same time describing conquering, enslaving, imperialist Islam as a religion of peace, love and toleration. Is it an ignorance of history? The armies of Allah first invaded mainland Europe, via Spain, in AD 711, 384 years before the launching of the First Crusade in 1095. The attempted Islamic conquest of Europe also continued long after the expulsion of the Crusaders from the Holy Land in 1291, only finally being checked at the 'gates of Vienna' in 1683. In each case, for all its many sins, Christendom was undeniably waging a war of defence, and Islam one of conquest. In considering the teachings underpinning Islamic imperialism, we should put to one side the often-repeated Jihadi boasts of the approaching day when the 'flag of Islam' will fly over Number Ten Downing Street or the White House (but never, interestingly, despite Moscow's butchery of the Syrians, Afghans and Chechens, the Kremlin) and examine what the most authoritative Islamic sources have to say on the subject.

Let us begin, just as all good Muslims do, with the prophet and his *Koran*. Tradition has it that at the very end of his life, in March 632, Mohammed gave this last message to the faithful: 'I was ordered to fight all men until they say "there is no God but Allah"'. The *Koran* itself says something very similar: 'And fight them on until there is no more tumult and oppression [that is, of Muslims], and there prevail justice and faith in Allah altogether and everywhere'. (Chapter 8, Verse 39) Although this citation refers only to fighting, there were and are two other means by which the goal of the universal rule of Islam can be achieved; firstly, by the voluntary conversion of the monotheist infidel or, secondly, failing this, his or her reduction to the inferior status of a *dhimmi*. Those who refuse either to convert or accept dhimmitude are to be killed. The remainder, polytheists, pagans and today, atheists and agnostics, are only given two choices, convert or be killed.

Even though not everyone will necessarily be a Muslim if or when Islam achieves its final goal of world conquest, it is only Islam and its Sharia law that will rule. Despite their divergences in other matters, all four schools of Sunni law agree with the various factions of Shi'a Islam as to the meaning, methods and goal of *Jihad*. The tenth century Maliki jurist Ibn Abi Zayd ruled that '*Jihad* is a precept of divine institution', while Hanbali jurist Ibn Taymiyyah (died 1328) concurred: 'Since lawful warfare is essentially *Jihad* and since its aim is that the religion is God's entirely and God's word is uppermost, therefore according to all Muslims, those who stand in the way of this aim must be fought.' Shaikh Burhanuddin Ali of Marghinan (died 1196) says on behalf the Hanafi school that 'if the infidels, upon receiving the call [to convert], neither consent to it nor agree to pay [the *dhimmi*] capitation tax, it is then incumbent for Muslims to call upon God for assistance, and to make war upon them'. Last up, we have Al-Mawardi (died 1058) for the Shafi school. Of those who refuse to heed the call to convert, 'war is waged against them and they are treated as those whom the call has reached'.

Shi'a Islam authorities say exactly the same. In the Persian manual of Shi'a law, written by al-Amili (died 1622) we read that 'Holy War against followers of other religions, such as Jews [sic], is required unless they convert to Islam or pay the [*dhimmi*] poll tax'. Other, more familiar names from the history of Islam have also voiced similar sentiments. Saladin, the (ironically, in view of decades of persecution by their Muslim brethren) Kurdish scourge of the Crusaders, was not, as he is often portrayed a 'resistance fighter', to use current parlance, but an avowed imperialist: 'I shall cross this sea [the Mediterranean] to their islands to pursue them until there remain no-one on the face of the entire earth who does not acknowledge Allah'. In our own time, we have had the high priest of Iran's 'Islamic Republic', the Ayatollah Khomeini promising, in the manner of a Muslim Trotsky, to 'export our [Islamic] revolution throughout the world until the calls "there is no God but Allah and Mohammed is the messenger of Allah" are echoed all over the world.' Finally, there is founder of al-Qaeda (though many Muslims celebrate him as the architect of 9/11, others rather ungenerously prefer to attribute it to the Jews or George Bush), Osama bin Laden: 'I was ordered to fight the people until they say there is no God but Allah and his prophet is Mohammed'. It seems so simple...and yet, in its pursuit, one after another, Islamic countries are laid waste as refugees flee and corpses pile up by the million, all being victims, not of the Jews or 'western imperialism', but the waging of *Jihad* for Allah.

In today's world of major league power politics, freelancing by lesser parties is a risky business. with little or no chance of lasting success. Just like that of his

mentor De Gaulle, French President Chirac's bid to construct a global anti-US alliance failed miserably. Similar attempts by national Islamic leaders to construct their own geopolitical alliances independently of both the Islamic bloc and the Arab League, and also free of any western entanglements have thus far also met with failure and even fiasco.

Gaddafi's vast oil revenues enabled him, quite apart from orchestrating anti-western terrorism on his own account, to become for a while the benefactor of a motley collection of movements and individuals ranging from Neo-Nazis, UK Trotskyists, Jihadis, Italian, German, Japanese, Basque and Irish terrorists, the African 'diamond war' criminal Charles Taylor, responsible for around a million deaths and the pioneering of 'child armies', the Serbian 'ethnic cleanser' Slobodan Milosevic, the assassins Carlos 'The Jackal' and Abu Nidal, and the Ugandan Muslim genocidist, Hitler admirer and cannibal, Idi Amin, to British trade union leaders, the PLO and all manner of splinter anti-Zionists and even earth mother pacifists. Then, changing tack in his last years, his atrocious crimes, although they still continued at home if not abroad, now forgiven or forgotten, he was embraced by the west as a reformed character, becoming a major contributor to the slush funds of the Italian Mafiosi politician Silvio Berlusconi, the no less venal French Gaullist Presidents Jacques Chirac and Nicolas Sarkozy, as well as Jorg Haider, the openly anti-Semitic leader of the Austrian Freedom party and of course, Gerry Healy's Workers Revolutionary Party. Having abjured terrorism, save against his own people, world statesmen queued up to play host to Gaddafi, including among them benefactors of his largess. As a special favour, Gaddafi even greeted UK Prime Minister Tony Blair in his tent, doubtless gratified that the UK Prime Minister had in a gesture of goodwill agreed to deliver up to the dictator a number of Gaddafi's exiled opponents. And, of course there was as always, ever ready to embrace a Muslim thug posing as a moderate, the-ever gullible Islamophile President Obama. So many friends. So powerful too. But when Gaddafi's subjects rose up against him, not a finger was lifted to save him.

Meantime, Iran's ayatollahs pursued their own Shi'a version of an Islamic geopolitics to counter the more substantial Sunni alignment of the Saudis, backing Assad in Syria, Hamas in Gaza and Hezbollah in Lebanon, to no great immediate advantage to themselves or their allies. In Yemen, support for the Shi'a Houthi militia brought Iran to the brink of military conflict with the Saudis, who intervened on the side of the embattled Sunni government forces. At the same already well advanced on the road to possessing their own nuclear arsenal and exploiting their kinship with the dominant Shi'a minority in Syria, and no less dominant Shi'a majority in central and southern Iraq, Iran's theocrats intended to supplant the Sunni Saudis as the leading power in the Middle East. Being Persian as well as Shi'a undoubtedly creates difficulties in a region overwhelmingly Arab and largely Sunni. And it remains to be seen if their great Sunni rivals, the Saudis and the Turks, will allow this to happen. In a bid to achieve a more global reach, Iran also forged fraternal links with the populist demagogue, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, who in return for substantial Iranian economic aid, pledged that he would 'stand by Iran at any time and under any condition'. How this would have been done from distance of nearly 12,000 kilometres was never quite made clear.

Iran's other major sally into South America was a terrorist attack in 1994 on the Jewish Community Centre in Buenos Aires. Master-minded by Iran's Cultural (sic) Attaché Mohsen Rabbani; it resulted in the deaths of 85 Jews. Once a Peronist

haven for wanted Nazi war criminals spirited away from their would-be Allied captors by courtesy of the Vatican's well-documented 'Rat Line', Argentina's political culture had never properly rid itself of its anti-Semitic undercurrents, and these came into play in the sequel to the 1994 massacre. Top Argentinean politicians were only too aware of who was responsible for the outrage, but rather than put at risk their anti-US credentials by exposing Iran's role in the affair, they chose instead to bloc attempts to bring its perpetrators to justice. But Jewish campaigners refused to let the matter die. Eventually an official investigation headed by Federal Prosecutor Alberto Nisman produced a 289-page report indicting amongst others, anti-Semitic Peronista President Cristina Fernandez Kirchner. (Without doubt fully appraised of his stance on the Falklands, she was one of the first world leaders to congratulate Corbyn on his election as Labour Leader. Corbyn had derided the British military operation to liberate the Falklanders as 'a Tory plot to keep their money-making friends in business'...yet another conspiracy.) The report uncovered a deal concluded after the crime between Argentina and Iran in which, in return for a cover-up of the massacre, Iran would supply oil on favourable terms, and would buy Argentinean wheat and military equipment. Four days after the report was released in January 2015, its author was found dead in his Buenos Aires apartment, shot in the head. President Fernandez blamed his faked 'suicide' on...the Jews.

The other dimension to Iran's foreign policy was of course the theocracy's bid to become yet another nuclear power in the region. Already, to Iran's east, there was Pakistan's Sunni bomb, and to Pakistan's south, India's Hindu bomb. To the north, there was Russia's Orthodox bomb, a high value card in Putin's poker game of imperial expansion, and, in Israel one suspects and I for one hope, a Jewish bomb. Obama, who set the conciliatory tone and terms for the negotiations with the Ayatollahs over their nuclear enrichment programme, probably saw Iran, as he already did the Saudis, as an ally, albeit in this case, an unofficial one, in the bid to 'contain' (this was Washington's stated objective) but not eliminate, the Sunni ISIS Caliphate.

Just as with Obama's dealings with the Saudi kingdom, this policy required that a curtain be discreetly drawn around the Iranian regime's brutally repressive domestic policies. Like all US presidential candidates, to be electable in his pious nation, Obama had to be god fearing and for capital punishment. Both qualifications could explain why he had not joined human rights organisations in condemning the well-documented relentless succession of torture, forced confessions, frame-up trials and executions of those who had possessed the courage to oppose the clerical fascists who ruled Iran. As the USA edged its way, state by state, towards its abolition, in Iran, the pace of judicial murder had been quickening, with Kurds, the Sharia left's 'western pawns', being singled out for special treatment. Just between January 1 and July 15, 2015, the number of executions soared to 694, an average of more than three per day. As the 'nuclear' talks between the west and Iran proceeded in Lausanne, back in Tehran it was business as usual, with 'Death to America' rallies and plenty of work for the hangmen. The Kurd Saman Naseen, arrested in April 2013 when only 17 years old, after being tortured and convicted of 'enmity against god' and 'corruption on earth', was hanged on February 20, 2015. On the same day, two Kurdish brothers suffered the fate. Then, on March 4, no fewer than six Kurds were hanged, accused of the same 'crime'. 'Pawns' indeed.

Except for those of human rights organisations (and who listens to them?) no voices in the west were raised in protest against this judicial carnage, for who would

want to rock the diplomatic boat with the Lausanne negotiations at such a delicate stage? And the holy hangmen of Tehran knew it. What more opportune time to rid themselves of trouble-makers? Mina Ahdi of the International Committee Against Executions made this very point, that during the Lausanne talks, 'there was absolute silence with regards to the high rate of executions and human rights violations in Iran' and that 'because of this silence, this matter has taken a turn for the worse.' In Iran's Karaj Central Prisons alone, 40 prisoners were selected for execution on April 11, 2015, and then hanged in batches. While the rebellious Kurds were the main domestic enemy, on November 2014, Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei declared that 'barbaric' (sic) Israel had 'no other cure but to be eliminated'. Defence Chief Ayatollah Salehi warned that 'no matter how many weapons are given to Israel, we are going to destroy them [the Jews]. We promise this task will be done.' Ayatollah Khamenei pledged that 'Allah willing, in twenty-five years' time there will be no more Israel'. Thus spoke Corbyn's former employers.

What had the Jews done to Iran to deserve a hated comparable to that of the Nazis when, like every other country, it has been the beneficiary of their unrivalled contributions to the betterment of life? Jews, who today comprise, at 15 million, a mere 0.2% of the world's population of seven and half billion, have been awarded 22% of all Nobel Prizes...205 at the last count. What would their total number of prizes have been but for the Holocaust? In the same period, beginning in 1901, Muslims, whose holy book says Jews are no more human than 'apes and swine', although comprising an estimated 25% of the world's population, more than 100 times that of the Jews, of a total awarded of 609, have won a paltry 13 Nobel Prizes, 2.1%, and less than 6% of the Jewish total. Even their three science prizes were each awarded to academics who conducted their research at infidel institutions, while of the seven Peace Prizes for activities that involved no intellectual achievement of any kind, one was laughably bestowed upon Yasser Arafat, despite the anti-Semitic terrorist's role as instigator of the Black September Munich Olympic massacre of eleven Israeli athletes. And they say that Scandinavians don't have a sense of humour?

By contrast, no fewer than 55% of the Nobel Prizes awarded to Jews were for medicine, advances calculated to have saved two billion lives, among them, we can be sure, countless Muslim ones. These were Jews who dedicated themselves not to the taking of life, but its preservation, enhancement and extension. Based upon the above statistics, not only is a Jew approximately 2,000 times more likely to win a Nobel Prize than a non-Jew, but 20,000 times more likely than a Muslim, perhaps for some, the most compelling proof yet for the existence and efficacy of a world Jewish conspiracy. When asked by Terry Wogan on BBC TV to explain anti-Semitism, Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks replied that it was due to people 'disliking Jews more than they have to.' The truth is, nobody likes to be made to look stupid.

24 Normal

France has been repeatedly selected as a target in the Jihadi war against the west, not because of its foreign policy, as the *dhimmi* left alleges, but because France is a bulwark of western secularism. The massacre of the staff of *Charlie Hebdo* and the decapitation of Samuel Paty were not political murders. If they were, why the assassins' cry of 'Allah is the Greatest' and 'the prophet is avenged'? They were motivated purely by theology, acts of revenge for displaying cartoon images of the prophet, the capital crime of blasphemy. Apart from Islamic terrorist acts of an earlier era connected with the war in Algeria, and France's subsequent support for the semi-secular FLN regime that came to power after the French withdrawal in 1962, other more recent Islamic killings, while not in every case explicit in their religious character, likewise cannot be attributed to Muslim hostility towards either the overseas or domestic policies and actions of the French government. On March 19, 2012, in an attack on a Jewish school in Toulouse, three pupils and a teacher were gunned down by self-proclaimed Jihadist, Mohammed Mera...the motive here being so obviously the hatred of Jews integral to Islamic teachings. Next came the massacre at the editorial offices of *Charlie Hebdo* on January 7, 2015. The two assassins were heard crying, not 'down with French imperialism', but 'Allah is the greatest.' Two days later, anti-Semitism was again the motive when, also in Paris, four Jews were shot dead by a lone gunman at a Jewish delicatessen. In the course of the siege that followed, the assassin pledged his allegiance to the Islamic State. And so we could go on.

On June 26, 2015, the Jihadi assault against France was renewed with a failed attempt to blow up a gas plant near Lyon. The attacker, delivery van driver Yassine Salhi, had first killed and decapitated his employer (as per Chapter 8 Verse 12 of the *Koran*) and then photographed himself with the severed head before displaying it as a trophy on the plant's gates, together with an ISIS flag and written messages of an Islamic nature. Unlike the UK's gutless politicians and the Sharia left, the secular and as likely as not, atheist French are not afraid to tell the world what they think about the motivations that drive such atrocities. Whereas Tory Prime Minister Cameron laughably described the murder of Lee Rigby by two Muslim converts as 'a crime against [sic] Islam', the local Socialist National Assembly deputy for Bouche-du-Rhone, Patrick Menucci, in a model of plain speaking, told it as it was: 'France is at war. I know it is not good to say so, but this terrorist attack in Saint-Quentin-Fallavier is the proof. We have on our territory individuals who don't obey the laws of the Republic but *fatwas* of the Islamic State...France is the most threatened county in Europe, notably because it defends secularism.' Exactly. Evidently not a paid-up member of the *dhimmi* left, where in secular France, it has found the soil less fertile. Here in the UK, where there is no such tradition, where we are the subjects, not citizens, of an unelected head of state who is also by right of birth head of our tax-payer subsidised state church, it is a sad comment on our lack of political maturity that non-believing mainstream politicians feel obliged to publicly proclaim their respect for ideas they have privately rejected as nonsense, and who, unless it is to oppose it, dare not so much as mention secularism, let alone support it, lest doing so places their careers in jeopardy.

There was another aspect to the Lyon atrocity of June 26 that was touched on in the Preface, and which has a direct parallel with similar cases in the UK. The arrested terror suspect was a Salafi Muslim with known past connections to Jihadist organisations. Yet his wife, before she was herself arrested displayed, genuinely or otherwise we cannot know, exactly the same disbelief that her husband could have committed such a crime, as do the relatives of those who, also supposedly without any warning, made their way to Syria to serve in the ISIS murder machine: 'I know my husband. We have a normal family life. He goes to work, he comes back. We are normal Muslims. We do Ramadan. We have three children and a normal family life'. Her 'normal' husband was indeed guilty, because he confessed to the crime two days later. So we had a scenario in which one day, a 'normal' member of this 'normal family' decided to change his normal routine and instead cut off a man's head and tries to blow up a gas works. Innocent of his intentions or not, I am inclined to believe her when she said that her family, including her husband, was 'normal', and that includes his Salafism if not his past terrorist associations. According to the *Koran*, for example Chapter 4, Verse 96, unless they have very compelling reasons that prevent them from doing so, 'normal', able bodied Muslim men are *supposed* to wage *Jihad* against the infidel in his own lands, and to cut off their heads if the opportunity presents itself. Then we had Mohammed Abdeslam, brother of two members of the team of assassins responsible for the Paris massacres of November 13, 2015, who insisted they were 'normal brothers' from 'an honest family'.

But then, like so much else, normality is in the eye of the beholder. In the time of the Nazi Holocaust, men from 'normal families', German in this case, many of them doubtless Nazis, who also went out to work, only they did not have to change their routine to commit murder because it was, so to speak, their day job. Between them they killed, or helped to kill, not just one man, but between them six million men, women and children. The extermination of the Jews would not have been possible if such men (and some women too) from such normal families had refused to carry out the orders of those who planned it and set it motion. It could be argued, and in fact has been, that Nazi Germany being the kind of state that it was, there was no choice other than to be become an accomplice, however unwilling, in Himmler's Holocaust. This was simply not true. Diligent research has established that refusing to serve in the various agencies charged with implementing the final solution rarely, if ever, incurred draconian punishments. Many Germans, 'ordinary Germans' as one researcher, Daniel Goldenhagen, described them, who did serve in punitive units were offered the opportunity by their commanding officers of excusing themselves from duties they found too distressing. Hardly any did so. But let the contrary claim stand, if only to make a contrast with the situation in today's France or any other civilised country afflicted with Islamic terrorism. For here the circumstances in which politically or religiously motivated murder takes place are fundamentally changed. A Muslim living in France is under no legal compulsion to wage *Jihad* against the country he is living in. In fact, the law forbids it, and severely punishes those who do. This is of course to state the obvious, but in such times as ours, the obvious occasionally needs stating. However, instead of obeying the laws of the land he is either born in or chose to live in, the Jihadi Muslim kills non-Muslims (preferably Jews) because he has decided to obey a command from his god that tells him that as a 'normal', 'ordinary', or 'good' Muslim, it is his sacred duty to kill those he believes are enemies of his religion.. As we have seen, the

kuffar-made laws of the land he lives in counted for nothing. Let us also not forget that throughout the European Islamic diaspora, millions of Muslims have made it very clear they wish to live under their own Sharia law rather than the laws of the country they live in.

On the same day of the decapitation at Saint-Quintin Fallavier, Friday, June 26, 2015, the first day of Muslim prayer in the holy month of Ramadan, Jihadism also struck in Tunisia, with the slaughter of 39, mainly British, tourists and the wounding of another 36 and, for the first time, in Kuwait, where a Saudi-born ISIS suicide bomber massacred 27 and wounded another 200 fellow Muslims at prayer in a Kuwait City mosque. The Tunisian assassin resembled his French brother in arms not only in being a 'lone wolf' killer, but also a very 'normal' one. Aged 23, management graduate Seifeddine Rezgui was described by a bemused uncle as a typically modern, football-loving and carefree young man:

We are all shocked when we heard the news and saw his picture, and his mother was devastated. Yes, he went to the mosque and prayed, but just like other men he would then go to the cafe and play football with his friends...The entire family is shocked at the hidden reality of what he was capable of. He used to use hair gel, wear the nicest clothes and go break dancing. He didn't even have a beard and I've never seen him with anyone with a beard. Now he's shooting people with a Kalashnikov.

In other words, like thousands of other suicide bombers, hijackers, Jihadis and assassins, he was just another normal, well-educated, certainly not poor, very ordinary young Muslim man. And like so many other young Muslim men, he also was visiting ISIS websites, undergoing terrorist training, at an ISIS camp in Libya, and posting religious on-line messages, the last one of which, smouldering with loathing for the world he seemed so much at one with, read: 'May God take me out of this unjust world and perish its people and make them suffer. They just remember you when you die.' As for the struggle against western imperialism, racism, poverty and the rest...not a word. On June 13, 2015, 17-year-old Talha Asmal became Britain's youngest ever suicide bomber when he drove a car packed with explosives at an Iraqi (sic) oil refinery. Friends described him as 'an ordinary Yorkshire lad.' Let us hope not. The same applies to 'Jihadi Jack' Lets, aka Abu Mohammed, whose parents appeared in court charged with funding his terrorist activities in Iraq on behalf of the Islamic State. According to his friends he was just a 'typical middle-class kid', yet his conversion to Islam transformed him into a hired murderer, something his parents simply refused to accept.

Another incredulous parent was that of the Orlando, Florida, gay night club assassin, Omar Mateen, whose family hailed originally from Afghanistan. His father, Mir Siddique, described his son as 'a very good boy', though his first wife left him after four months of (*Koran*-sanctioned) regular beatings. Mir Siddique initially claimed the atrocity, which left 49 dead and another 53 wounded, had nothing to do with religion, but had been triggered by the sight of two gay men kissing in Miami. Even if that had proved to be true, which it did not, the question still remained: why this murderous hatred for gay men? Where did that come from if not his religion? Only a matter of weeks previous to the Orlando massacre, a UK-born Doctor and Islamic theologian preaching in Miami's Husseini Centre had instructed his listeners, who, it is reasonable to assume, could have very likely included the homophobic Oma Mateen, as to the punishment prescribed by Sharia

Law for homosexuality: 'Death is the sentence. We know this. There is nothing to be embarrassed about. We have to have compassion for people. With homosexuals, it's the same. Out of compassion, let's get rid of them now.' Following his sermon, Sheikh Farrokh Sekaleshfar was invited to speak at Stanford University. The day after the Orlando massacre, the Hussein Islamic Centre conducted a prayer session for the 49 gays who had been compassionately got rid of. When it was put to the Sheikh that his call for the killing of gays may have contributed to the Orlando killings, he replied that 'such a connection is impossible, because had the shooter listened to my lecture, he would have clearly heard me condemn hate and violence multiple times and endorse compassion towards humankind at all times.' He would also have heard that, in the case of homosexuals, this 'compassion' required that Muslims had to 'get rid of them now.' Sekaleshfar's no-nonsense method of dealing with homosexuality was shared by the Islamic State, which issued a statement saluting 'one of the Caliphate's soldiers in America' for carrying out 'a security invasion where he was able to enter a crusader gathering at a night club for homosexuals in Orlando, Florida, where he killed and wounded more than a hundred of them before he was killed.' The killer's father, however believed that his son had, not literally but theologically, jumped the gun: 'God himself will punish those involved in homosexuality, this is not for the servants of God.'

Any doubts as to the assassin's motives were resolved when later the same day, NBC reported that Mateen, already known by the police, like so many other young diaspora Muslims, to have Jihadi sympathies, had interrupted his assault to phone emergency services to declare his allegiance to the Islamic State, which like any self-respecting Islamic theocracy, also executes its homosexuals, though not by shooting but by throwing them from the roofs of tall buildings. The very next day, in faraway Qatar, venue for the 2022 World Cup, *kuffars* saw another demonstration of Muslim compassion when a Dutch woman was convicted by an Islamic court of the crime of having sexual relations outside of wedlock when she was drugged and then raped by a Muslim man. For her violation of Sharia law, she received a one-year suspended jail sentence and was ordered to be deported. A court official said the sentence was 'lenient' and that 'had she been Muslim, she would have received at least five years in jail'...for being raped while unconscious. Just as Professor Briggs and Laurie Penny say, Muslim women have it so easy compared to their infidel western sisters.

Another run-of-the-mill Muslim was the convert Elton Simpson, one of two Jihadis who were killed by police before they could attack the free speech 'Draw Mohammed' competition in Garland, Texas. Nonplussed by Simpson's desire to kill and be killed for Allah, his lawyer described him as a 'normal guy'. Again, the same adjective and yet, at least by non-Muslim standards, once again very abnormal behaviour. Then we have Kuwait-born Mohammed Yousef Abdulazeez, aged 24. A former school friend, not himself a Muslim, remembered him as 'honestly one of the funniest guys I ever met. I never saw a violent bone in his body.' But on-line, this 'funny guy' was speculating, not with his bones but his brain, on how to 'separate the inhabitants of paradise from the inhabitants of hell fire.' He found the (inevitably violent) solution on July 16, 2015, when he gunned down five marines in Chattanooga, before being killed himself by police. It was same story yet again when a Muslim husband and wife team armed with assault rifles killed 14 and wounded 21 local government workers at a gathering in Saint Bernardino, California in December 2015. While Obama, predictably speculated and obviously

hoped that the killings could be 'work place related' (sic) and relatives of the husband, Syed Rizwan Farook, described him as 'cordial, liberal minded [sic] and well-liked', it quickly transpired that his wife had proclaimed her allegiance to the Islamic State on Facebook shortly before the assault, and that the couple's home had been converted into a Jihadi arsenal liberally stocked with explosive devices.

Global polling has time and again revealed that the beliefs that drive such actions are not abnormal for young Muslims. According to the results of a poll released in July 2015, 42 million diaspora Muslims sympathised with the Islamic State. A survey of 1,000 UK Muslims conducted in April the same year indicated that 11% of females and 5% of males identified with the Islamic State, a statistic borne out by the increasing number of women making the journey to Syria. However, 39% of UK Muslims blamed the British authorities when this happened, and only 29% the relatives of those who make the trip. Naturally, just like Cameron and Obama, no Muslim spokesman could be heard entertaining the thought that volunteering to fight and died for ISIS could have anything to do with their religion. Neither was there any serious attempt to explain what it was to with. What we do know is that 'profiling' of diaspora Muslim terrorists has proved they do not conform to the stereotype of the downtrodden and oppressed rebel concocted by the *dhimmi* media and Sharia left. They are not typically outsiders, losers, loners, poor, uneducated and unemployed. They are not even obviously and demonstrably anti-western or devout, or anything else other than yes, 'normal' Muslims.

Neither is the Jihadi, with his readiness, his obligation, even his yearning to die, the victim of a perversion of Islam, as so many politicians, in defiance of all the evidence, fondly imagine. As we have seen, the summons to *Jihad* is repeatedly proclaimed in Islam's holiest of texts, the *Koran*. and everywhere in the diaspora,, 'normal', 'ordinary' young men, fathers and husbands as well as sons, and increasingly women, mothers and wives as well as daughters, answered the call. Even then, most politicians, unlike Patrick Menucci, seemed unable to grasp or, if they did, say in public, what was motivating this onslaught. In the wake of the Tunis, Kuwait and French killings, Cameron yet again confidently assured the public that none of those responsible, even though all were at the time totally unknown to him, had anything to do with Islam. Without being aware of any of the details of the three attacks, or of what their perpetrators were thinking at the time they were carried out, he still felt able to say with total certainty that these crimes had not been committed by genuine Muslims, but 'in the name of a twisted and perverted ideology'. If that is so, two question needed to be answered: – how did Cameron come by this knowledge, and, secondly, what was the name of the 'ideology' (not, be it noted, 'religion') that had, so he claimed, been 'perverted and twisted'? While Cameron was evidently certain he knew all that was needed to be known about the suspect in the French murder to be able to ascertain that his motives were not Islamic, on the day after the attack, Paris Public Prosecutor Francois Molins was quite rightly in no hurry to arrive at such a conclusion. 'Questions remain as to the exact chronology of events, what happened when he [the suspect] arrived, the circumstances of the decapitation, the motivation [sic] and whether there were accomplices.'

Perhaps he should have given the UK Prime Minister a call, because Cameron seemed to be privy to information that at the time was not yet available to the French authorities. He yet again demonstrated his level of expertise in matters Islamic when, three days after the triple assaults, he took the unprecedented step of advising

the BBC, whose rules of governance were supposed to protect it from such interference, on how to report atrocities committed by Muslims in the name of the Islamic state: 'I wish the BBC would stop calling it the Islamic State because it is not an Islamic State.' Since its independence was at issue, the BBC response was initially commendably robust, though it was not long before for it complied with Cameron's request, even though BBC Director General, Lord Hall of Birkenhead, initially made it clear that the corporation would continue to 'preserve its impartiality'. A Radio Four programme presenter made the telling point that if, as Cameron preferred, all BBC references to the Islamic State were to be prefixed by the term 'so-called', this practice, to be consistent and neutral, would have to be extended to all states whose official title could be questioned, as for example the People's Republic of China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Democratic People's Republic of (north) Korea and the United Kingdom.

Re-enforcing Cameron's successful bid to bring the BBC to heel, the Muslim Tory MP Rahman Chiski drafted a letter to Lord Hall endorsed by over a hundred MPs complaining that calling the Islamic State by its name 'gives legitimacy to a terrorist organisation that is not Islamic'. 'Not Islamic? There were millions of Muslims, many of them living in the UK, who would have begged to differ. The Caliph of the Islamic State (without prefix, *pace* Cameron), Ibn 'Awwad al-Husyni al-Qurashi (aka Abu Bakr-al Baghdadi) certainly would. Even his Muslim critics did not deny that he was as well-qualified and versed as any other cleric in matters of Islamic theology and law, and certainly more so than the MPs who signed the letter of protest to the BBC. His message to the world, released on May 14, 2015, titled 'March Forth Whether Light or Heavy', was a summons to all Muslims to wage *Jihad*, if necessary, to the death, for their faith against its enemies. Unlike the MP's letter, which contained none, the Caliph's message was replete with references to and citations from hallowed Koranic verses that sanctified the necessity of war against the infidel. Those cited include: al-Baqarah 216, An-Nisa 74, al-Tawbah 38-39, al-Ahzab 62, al-Imran 140-142, Fatir 43 and Al-Ankahut 6. He also cited a *hadith* of Bukhari, which runs:

And who ever say 'my prophet is Mohammed', it is incumbent upon him - if he is truthful in his claim - to follow his example. And he is the one who said: 'And by he in whose hand is Mohammed's soul, I would love to fight for the cause of Allah and be killed, and then fight for the cause of Allah and be killed again, and then fight for the cause of Allah and be killed again.'

We get the idea. The Caliph was also better versed than his detractors not only in the theology but also the history of Islam: 'Oh Muslims, Islam was never for a day a religion of peace. Mohammed was ordered to wage war until Allah is worshipped alone.' This is indeed what the *Koran* says, in Chapter 2, Verse 194. Going on the evidence of the arguments presented for and against the Islamic State being what it claimed to be, Caliph al-Qurashi, who had a Doctorate in Islamic Theology, won hands down. It was simply no contest. That is why no amount of rhetoric from Islam-ignorant politicians was likely to have had any impact on the flow of volunteer Jihadis flocking to the Caliphate, or the far broader ground swell of sympathy its actions generated both in the Islamic world and the Muslim diaspora. Muslim clerics dared not engage al-Qurashi in genuine debate because doing so would have involved repudiating the universally accepted sources upon

which he founded his actions. He was not a fraud, or an 'extremist', and his Muslim critics knew it. He believed every word he said, and what he said was rooted in the very core of Sunni Islam. So all we heard from the voices of so-called moderation was denials, but no refutations. The concept and goal of the Caliphate, the world-wide Islamic state that unites all Muslims in one single community governed by Sharia law, the *Ummah*, lies at the very heart of Sunni Islam. It is not, as Cameron, Corbyn and Obama seemed to think, an unislamic aberration, any more than is *Jihad*.

Ever since its abolition in 1924 by Kemal Ataturk, the restoration of the Caliphate has remained the objective of theocratic movements like the Muslim Brotherhood (founded in 1928 for that purpose) and its more recent Jihadi offshoots such as Hamas and al-Qaeda. In the last years before the emergence of the Islamic State in 2014, all around the world, voices could be heard demanding the return of the Caliphate and defining how it should rule. Hamza Tzortzis of the UK-based Islamic Education and Research Academy (sic) made it clear that as Muslims 'reject the idea of freedom of speech and even of the idea of freedom', the restored Caliphate would do the same. The individual as such would no longer exist. As slaves of Allah, subjects of the Caliphate would 'engage with each other in a positive and productive way to produce results.' These 'results' were not enumerated, but we can guess what they might be. Hizb ut-Tahrir is a US-based world-wide Muslim organisation which, like so many others, is dedicated to the goal of re-establishing the Caliphate. And, also like the other definitions already cited, that of Hizb ut-Tahrir's contrasted the principles governing the rule of the Caliphate with those of western democracy, which it sought first to undermine and then destroy. One must acknowledge the frankness and clarity of the contrast that it made between the two systems of rule and their utter incompatibility:

The republican system is based on democracy, where sovereignty is given to the people. Thus, the people have the right of ruling and legislation. They reserve the right to lay down a constitution and enact laws and to abolish, alter or modify both the constitution and the law. This bears no resemblance to the Islamic system, which is based solely on the Islamic faith and the Islamic legislation. Sovereignty is to the legislation of Allah and not to the *Ummah* [the community of Muslims, i.e., the people]. So the *Ummah* has no right to legislate nor does the Khaleefah. The sole legislator is Allah, and the Khaleefah has only the right to adopt rulings for the constitution that are derived from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah Prophet of Muhammad.

In a word, theocracy, where laws are made in heaven, and enforced on earth by a clerical caste. The Syrian Jihadist, Abu Mohammad al-Jualani described the Caliphate in the same totalitarian terms: 'Being Muslims, we do not believe in political parties or parliamentary elections, but rather an Islamic regime based on the *Shura* [an advisory council staffed by clerics].' Another Syrian Jihadi, Ahmad Issa, defined the Caliphate as 'a state of justice and truth. We want people to be ruled by an infallible law - the law of Allah. We do not want people to be ruled by man-made laws.' This is of course precisely the definition of 'human rights' enunciated in 1990 by the Cairo meeting of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference. Not only in Syria, destined to be its birth place, but across the Muslim diaspora from Australia through Europe to the USA, the call was being made for the return of the Caliphate and with it, an end to western ideas of freedom, democracy and rule by

man-made laws. Having failed to detect the signs of its coming, now that the Islamic State was upon them, politicians tried to persuade themselves and their publics that the Islamic State was not Islamic. When Cameron addressed the Global Security Forum in Bratislava on June 19, 2015, he listed the features of what he defined as the 'extremist Islamist ideology' as being 'one that says the West is bad, that democracy is wrong, that women are inferior, that homosexuality is evil, that religious doctrine trumps the rule of law and Caliphate the nation state, that justifies violence in asserting itself and achieving its aims.'

What Cameron describes here and, it must be said, quite accurately, is not a mythical 'extremist Islamism', *but Islam itself*. Anyone acquainted with the *Koran* would have known this to be so. Yet the current Pope Francis II, who does claim to be well-informed, as he should be, about a faith that has as its aim the supplanting of his own, shares Cameron's belief in an Islam that never existed, does not exist and according to accepted teachings and rulings, cannot exist:

Faced with disconcerting episodes of violent fundamentalism, our respect for the true followers of Islam should lead us to avoid hateful generalisations, for authentic Islam and the proper [sic] reading of the *Koran* are opposed to *every* [sic] form of violence.

A 'proper reading'? Woe betides any Catholic who takes the same liberties with his or any of his predecessors' edicts. Fortunately, there is another way of reading the *Koran*, and it is just like reading any other text, for example this statement by the Pope. that it means what it says. For a true believer, the meaning of a passage from the *Koran* is not contingent on its 'context' since, being the word of God, it is timeless and not subject to 'proper readings', revisions or 'interpretations' by mere mortals. And unlike the Bible, which proceeds chronologically, and in which time and place are integral to the message, much of the *Koran* is in fact contextless, as if its receiver, Mohammed is in a limbo, *sans* place, *sans* time. Consequently, if the passage in question unambiguously commands those that read or hear it to commit acts of violence, as the *Koran* does, over and over again (see Appendix L), no amount of 'contextualisation', or 'reading', 'proper' or otherwise, is going to make it say and mean anything else, least of all an absolute commitment to non-violence, because, whatever Mohammed was, he was not a pacifist. I strongly recommend that Pope Francis reads again the following two passages from what I assume is his unexpurgated edition of the *Koran*. and explain how he arrives at the conclusion that it is opposed to 'every [no less!] form of violence', including assumedly that of wife beating or, as here, 'I will instil terror [sic] into the hearts of the unbeliever: smite ye above their necks and smite off all their fingertips.' (8: 12) Pope Francis ought to bear in mind that he is, despite his futile ecumenical strivings, also numbered among the 'unbelievers'. (I wrote this a full year before two Muslims cut the throat of a Catholic priest in his Rouen church.) The next citation should have a familiar ring for the Pope:

...those who defy their Lord, for them will be cut out a garment of fire: over their heads will be poured boiling water. With it will be scalded what is within their bodies as well as their skins. In addition, there will be maces of iron to punish them. Every time they wish to get away therefrom, from anguish, they will be forced back therein, and, it will be said, 'Taste ye the Penalty of Burning.' (22: 19-22)

‘The penalty of burning’! And we thought the Pope’s Church had patented it. And whereas the last burning at the stake by the Spanish Inquisition was in 1826, the ultra-orthodox Islamic State was still doing it two centuries later, though in cages. Perhaps Pope Francis II was, in a not too subtle a fashion, advising us to read the *Koran* as so many Christians (including of course Roman Catholics) do the Bible, that is, by cherry picking, skipping over the nasty, ignorant and embarrassing bits, which multiply with the advance of civilisation and the progress of science, and concentrating on an ever-shrinking remainder. What Pope Francis failed to understand was that despite the word games played by clerics and theologians, the overwhelming majority of Muslims who can read - less than half the total - cannot, in fact dare not, ‘read’ their holy texts in the same ‘proper’ that is, selective way.

To return to Cameron, if the Islamic State is not Islamic, then why, only a matter of hours after he gave this assurance, did reports reach the west that the non-Islamic Islamic State had beheaded two married Muslim couples for allegedly practising sorcery, and crucified five Muslim men for violating Ramadan fasting rules? If the Islamic State was not, as Cameron insisted, Islamic, then why should those who govern it care whether anyone practises sorcery, or eats at the wrong times during Ramadan? With his frequently advertised deep understanding of the workings of Islamic jurisprudence, Cameron should surely have been more aware than most that these actions are serious crimes under Sharia law, and that the Islamic State punishes them in strict accordance with methods prescribed in the *Koran*, namely crucifixion and beheading. As Cameron, given his expertise, must have known, the *Koran* forbids sorcery in Chapter 2, Verse 102, and Chapter 4, Verse 113. According to Islamic sources, ‘punishment for the sorcerer has been authentically reported from three companions of the prophet’. The relevant *fiqh* or legal ruling runs thus: ‘The prophet commanded, “Kill every sorcerer, for this is the punishment ordered by Allah”’. And surely he knew that according to a saying of the prophet, as related by the website *Islam Question and Answer*, anyone breaking the fast of Ramadan, one of the five pillars of Islam, is guilty of heresy, and it is therefore ‘permissible to shed his blood’.

The west’s supposed Islamic major ally in the fight against a nebulous ‘extremism’, the indisputably orthodox Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, also strictly enforces this same Koranic law on sorcery, also by cutting off heads in public, thus acting no differently than the supposedly non-Islamic, ‘terrorist’ and ‘extremist’ Islamic State. Why is one Islamic and not the other when they both uphold and enforce in exactly the same way the same Sharia laws? Saudi Arabia also indoctrinates children in anti-Semitism, has banned women from driving, imposes the same dress code as the non-Islamic Islamic State, cuts off heads with a sword, promotes the *Protocols*, executes homosexuals, administers 1,000 lashes to anyone who criticises Saudi society and outlaws all religions except Islam. Could not these policies and actions also be considered ‘extreme’? And should we not expect from the same MPs who signed their letter protesting against the BBC’s use of the term Islamic State to submit another, requesting that the BBC in future refers to the ‘so-called Islamic Republic of Iran’ because, like the Islamic State, its clerical rulers also sanction the stoning of women to death and executing gays, the only difference being that whereas the Islamic State hurled them from the roofs of tall buildings, Iran threw them from clifftops? In this respect, Iran is more orthodox than the Caliphate, if only for topographical reasons because, according to a *Hadith* of a descendent of Mohammed, the Sixth Imam, Jafar As-Sadiq, there are three methods

of carrying out the death penalty for a homosexual act: 'By tying the arms and feet and throwing from a cliff, by beheading, or being burnt alive.'

These refusals by politicians and clerics to acknowledge the Islamic nature of ISIS led Haras Rafiq of the reformist Quilliam Foundation to complain that they all follow a policy of 'he who shall not be named, with no-one actually coming out and saying it is an Islamist Ideology. It is totalitarian and fascist; it gets people to do things for God in order to rally them to its cause.' Comments such as this have resulted in the Quilliam Foundation being denounced by mainstream Muslim organisations as apostates and by the Sharia left as stooges of western imperialism. Why is it left to brave reformist Muslims (and it should be said even braver ex-Muslims) to shame our politicians by being the only ones to have the courage and honesty to call things by their right names? The truth is, whatever western politicians said, millions of Muslims thought the Islamic State was not only an Islamic State, but the *only* Islamic State, and that amongst them, there were thousands who were prepared to kill and die for it.

What this semantic chicanery tells us is that politicians and clerics were refusing, for a variety of reasons, to publicly acknowledge what they must have known to be true, that a religious war was being waged against the West, one *au fond* of the seventh century against the twenty first, of the culture of the ancient desert against that of the modern western metropolis. And we should not assume, because of the west's vastly superior culture and technology (though as regards the latter, the gap is narrowing, and with the west's assistance) that its victory is assured. There have times in the past when a more primitive culture has overwhelmed one more advanced. Byzantium, the last repository of classical Greek learning, was subjugated by primitive Turkic Muslims swarming out of the depths of Asia, while the civilisation that that was Rome's succumbed to successive waves of Germanic barbarian invasions from the north. To this day, Russia bears the all too visible marks of its subjugation by the Mongols, while the Balkans have still to fully eradicate the legacy of the religious and ethnic hatreds bequeathed by four centuries of Ottoman despotism. There can be regression as well as progression. Our hard-won freedoms are an inheritance that can never be taken for granted. The problem is not only that they are, but their value is being questioned even by those who whose responsibility it is to defend them.

25 Spiked

When PEN America conferred on the murdered *Charlie Hebdo* staff its annual Freedom of Expression Award, 143 (yes, 143) writers signed a letter of protest, describing it as a reward for the magazine's mocking 'a section of the French population that is already marginalised, embattled, and victimised'. This of course was a lie, because *Charlie Hebdo's* satire was directed not against individual Muslims, but against the absurdities of a belief system that Muslims, not just in France but throughout the world, through their own free choice (so at least we are told) subscribe to. For these writers, as is the case with politicians, while they paid lip service to free speech in general, when it came to Islam, different rules were to be applied. By setting limits to what could be subjected to satire, the protest was in effect arguing the case for a system of self-censorship in which the criterion for what can or cannot be satirised is not the idea in itself, but those who believe in it:

The magazine seems [sic] to be entirely sincere its anarchic expressions of disdain toward organised religion. But in an unequal society, equal offence does not have an equal effect. Power and prestige are elements that must [sic] be recognised in considering almost any [sic] form of discourse including satire.

Down the ages, from the time of the ancient Greeks to Swift and Voltaire, one of the functions of literature and drama has been to provoke thought, to challenge ideas and beliefs that the writer considers false, even absurd; in Shelley's immortal words, to be 'the unacknowledged legislators of the world'. But no longer. Self-censorship has become the order of the day. Instead of exposing the myths, superstitions and falsehoods that cause and sustain injustice, the writers' duty is to protect them from criticism when they are believed in by the 'marginalised, embattled and victimised', as indeed they need to be if the existing injustices of society are to be sustained. And this from writers who saw themselves as the defenders of the underdog! The rule being proposed runs something like this:

Just because a belief is absurd, laughably ridiculous, patent nonsense, or even harmful in its effects to believer and unbeliever alike, does not mean that it can be lampooned. First it must be established who believes in it. If it is believed in by those with 'power and prestige', then it is open season. But not if it is the belief of the 'marginalised, embattled and victimised'. Their beliefs [which are often the main cause of their 'marginalisation'] are sacred.

But wait a moment. Excluding *dhimmi* feminists, surely few will deny Muslim men use Islam to 'marginalise' 'their' women. So why not 'punch upwards' at the Islamic patriarchy, and ridicule the arrogant delusions of Muslim misogynists? Or at Muslim homophobia, which not only 'marginalises' gays, but under Islamic law, puts them to death? For the sake of the argument, let us allow, even though it is patently not true, that all diaspora Muslims, even those who comprise its clerical, political and business establishment, are the new underdogs of the western world, a substitute, so the Sharia left seems to think, for an indigenous proletariat that has consistently spurned its summons to the barricades. This diaspora, concentrated overwhelming in Europe, and to a much smaller degree in the Americas, comprises

less than 5% of the total world Muslim population. Nowhere in this diaspora do Muslims suffer political or religious persecution, as for example Shia's do in Sunni-ruled states and visa-versa. Unlike all Muslim women in all Islamic states (and all non-Muslims in some Islamic states), they are equal before the law. Though they may well be less prosperous on average than those of the host society (partly at least because, as we have seen in the case of the UK, most Muslim women are confined to their homes), they enjoy an education, health care and welfare and employment rights vastly superior to that provided by any of the 56 countries where Islam is the state religion. So yes, we can in part at least agree with the PEN protestors that Islam is indeed a religion of the oppressed. But those doing the oppressing, with the exceptions of the regimes in China and Myanmar, where they escape condemnation by the left, are in every case also Muslims, Muslim men to be precise, and they use Islam to do it.

The real under and top dogs of Islam are in those countries where Muslims make up the overwhelming majority of the population. In no sense can the Muslim rulers of the kingdoms of Morocco and Saudi Arabia, and of Sudan, Yemen, Syria, Pakistan, Iran, Indonesia and the oil Sheikdoms of the Gulf, just to name a few, be described in any sense as 'marginalised, embattled and victimised', or lacking in 'power and prestige', though their subjects, especially when they dare to think for themselves, certainly can. So why then should the cruel and primitive beliefs of their political masters not be considered fair game? Is it the satirist's fault they are shared by those in a less exalted station, especially woman, whom their rulers have brainwashed almost from birth in order to keep them there? One of the signatories to the protest, the US writer Francine Prose (sic), even detected in the award a racist and imperialist plot, which she described in classic post-modernist babble: 'The narrative [sic] of the *Charlie Hebdo* murders - white Europeans killed in their office by Muslim extremists - is one that feeds neatly ['neatly']...but of course...a conspiracy is afoot] into cultural prejudices that have allowed our government to make so many mistakes in the Middle East.' But 'white Europeans' were killed by (non-white) 'Muslims extremists'. That is a fact, not a 'narrative', just as it is fact, and not a 'narrative', that these same 'Muslims extremists' were avowedly killing 'white Europeans' (more precisely, journalists), not as participants, knowingly or otherwise, in a white supremacist 'narrative, but in the name of their religion.

The actual Paris massacre, with its well-advertised religious motive - 'the prophet is avenged' - had been conveniently supplanted by a fictitious 'narrative' with a racist slant (conducted by whom we are not told) which, in its turn, by exploiting certain 'cultural prejudices', 'feeds neatly', as all conspiracies do, into a plot to further the aims of US foreign policy. We only a step away from the staff of *Charlie Hebdo* being complicit in this plot by offering themselves up as its supposed victims. And why not, since millions, and not all of them Muslims by a long way, believe the hijackers of 9/11 sacrificed themselves for Israel, not Allah. The central issue of press freedom versus Islamic intolerance and terror had thus been spirited away, to be replaced by an imaginary, crackpot racist-imperialist conspiracy. Satire, viewed from this perspective, was not only a means of further oppressing the already oppressed Muslim diaspora of the west. It was also a weapon of US imperialism, directed against the Muslims of the East. And yet the harshest critics of Islam are to be found, not among the likes of *Charlie Hebdo*, but amongst its apostates, which is of course exactly what one would expect, as is also the case with ex-Roman Catholics. Surely it is they who deserve, and no less need, the support

and solidarity of western writers who enjoy all the freedoms Muslim apostates in many cases risk their lives for. What they actually get from the left is ostracism, slander...and 'no-platforming'.

One of the arguments for 'going easy' on Islam is that it is largely a faith of non-white peoples. But here too we encounter another inconsistency. The prevalence of Christianity amongst black Africans has not proved an obstacle to western critiques, including satire, of their faith. And what a target it is! Up there with Allah's rules on farting is the Roman Catholic Eucharist. The Pope, who undeniably enjoys enormous temporal as well as spiritual power and prestige, and commands untold wealth, believes, and demands that others believe, that in the miracle of transubstantiation, a chunk of bread, when consecrated by a priest, is mysteriously transformed into the actual body of Christ who, while remaining in heaven with his body intact, is also loaning it out at the same time, again intact, to thousands of other priests performing the identical ritual at the same time. This belief in the physical presence of Christ at the Eucharist, together with the supremacy of the Pope, is without doubt the very bedrock of the Roman rite. As the current Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church has it, 'the other sacraments and indeed all the ecclesiastical ministries and works of the apostolate are bound up with the Eucharist and are oriented towards it'.

How strange then that it took the best part of eleven centuries for transubstantiation to become adopted as an official dogma of the Roman church at the fourth Lateran Council of 1215. By the Reformation, some had begun to doubt whether bread could be transformed into god. Others rejected it altogether as superstitious mumbo jumbo or, as the English expression has it, *hocus pocus*, a conjuring trick, from the Latin *hoc est corpus*, here is the body. It was with good reason then that the Catechism adopted by the 'Counter Reformation' Council of Trent (1545-1563), after conceding that 'the exposition of this mystery is most difficult', decreed: 'the faithful are to be admonished that they do not inquire too curiously into the manner in which this change may be made, for it defies our powers of conception, nor have we any example of it in natural changes nor in the creation of things itself.' Just so.

Curiosity, the thirst for knowledge, so medieval theologians (but not the Bible) warned us, is one of the original sins of Adam and Eve that we all inherit. So also says Msgr. Charles Pope (sic), who has 'led Bible studies at the US Congress and the White House' no less. He says it is 'a dagger that cuts deep into the soul'. Yet because of this 'sin', science has generated the knowledge and means that sustain and enhance our lives on this planet, not least those of the USA, and including those like Msgr. Pope who disseminate and believe in this nonsense. Hundreds of millions of otherwise quite rational, educated people, many if not most with some awareness of the workings of the natural world, some even who are themselves scientists, are not only obliged to believe a chunk of bread can become god, but actually do, or at least say they do. Nor is this the end of it. Roman Catholics are also obliged to believe that no matter how many times the chunk of bread, or 'wafer' (the 'species' or 'host') is subdivided, each newly created fraction of the whole wafer contains, or rather actually is, the complete body of Christ, not just a *pro rata* portion of it, for example the nail on his left little toe.

Having ruled as heretical the atomic theories of the Greek philosopher Democritus (*circa* 470-360 BC), and the Roman materialist and sceptic Lucretius (99-55 BC), which correctly presumed that matter is composed of finite indivisible

(today what we know as sub-atomic) particles, the Catholic Church instead held matter to be infinitely divisible. If true, it was therefore at least theoretically possible, by subdivision repeated *ad infinitum* of a crumb of consecrated bread, to generate an infinite number of bodies of Christ. Today, the Church, no thanks to the Bible, should know better, that this process of the subdivision of the host has its natural limits, theoretically continuing until the original chunk is reduced via millions of individual molecules and billions of atoms down through sub-atomic quarks and the like to god's very own sub sub atomic, aptly named god particle, the Higgs Boson, resulting in trillions of bodies of Christ. Although it took three centuries to do so, the Vatican did finally accept that the earth revolved around the sun. However, today, in defiance of modern atomic theory, the infinite divisibility of the 'host' remains, and because of its centrality to the doctrine of transubstantiation, presumably will be for evermore the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on the miracle and aptly described 'mystery' of the Eucharist. No wonder the Council of Trent advised that 'pastors should also use no less caution in explaining the mysterious manner in which the body of our Lord is contained whole and entire under the least particle of the bread.' So here in the 21st century, we find the current *Catechism* still insisting, as its authors feel they must, that the faithful are required to believe 'Christ is present whole and entire in each of the species and whole entire in each of their [the species'] parts, in such a way [sic] that the breaking of the bread does not divide Christ', and perhaps as both a warning and an aid to doubters, quotes St Thomas Aquinas, to the effect that the body and blood of Christ 'cannot be apprehended by the senses, but only by faith.'

What a (literally) god given subject for satire! For example, what happens to Christ after what remains of the matter comprising the wafer has been ingested, masticated, digested and then excreted into the sewage system? Can a communicant, by pretending to swallow the host, retain Christ in the mouth, take him home, spit him out, and give him pride of place on the mantelpiece between a statue of the virgin Mary and a picture of the Pope? But wait. Not only the supreme authority in matters of doctrine believes this nonsense, along with Jesuit scholars, the carefully selected elite of Opus Dei and high-profile converts such as the former Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair and former Tory Cabinet Ministers Ann Widdecombe and John Gummer. So, in their own way, and probably with more conviction, do hundreds of millions of desperately poor 'marginalised' and 'embattled' Africans, South Americans and Phillippinoes. Are we then to assume that *The Life of Brian* parody of the life of Jesus and Father Ted's and Dave Allen's poking fun at the Roman Catholic Church are to be condemned as complicit in the same imperialist and racist 'narrative' that is said to have been conducted (by whom we are not told) to exploit the murder of the white staff of *Charlie Hebdo*? I fancy not...because Christianity is 'our' religion, and therefore, according to the Chomsky rule, unlike Islam, fair game.

The principle at work in the minds of those who protested against the PEN Award, though not stated clearly as such, is that the most important, maybe even the only factor that should determine one's attitude to a belief is not whether it is true or false, but the social, ethnic, religious, racial or 'gender' identity of those who hold it. This condescending, paternalist inverse *ad hominem*, masquerading, in the case under review, as radical anti-racism, and which was once described to me, approvingly, as 'only punching upwards', is deeply patronising in its attitude towards those it claims to be protecting from the 'narrative' of the 'powerful and

prestigious', since it assumes this can only be achieved by insulating them from the need to confront the falsity of their own beliefs, the very beliefs than help sustain their 'marginalisation'. On the same grounds of protecting the minds of Muslims from hurt and insult, one can proscribe the teaching of evolution and the Holocaust to Muslim children, and in fact, this has been demanded by Muslim students and parents both in the UK and France, and what is more, in some cases, granted. The latter has also been proposed, as we have seen, by a German (yes, *German*) politician, and is actually officially in force in *dhimmi* Sweden. (See Appendix C)

In the pursuit of a spurious social or racial justice, objective truth (that is, if it even exists which some now doubt or even deny) counts for nothing. By this reckoning Islam's take on reality with its flat earth and geocentric universe, is just as valid as Newton's three laws of motion and, even if isn't, it should be treated as if it is. If indeed it is so wrong to satirise the beliefs of the poor and the weak, then those who argue thus in the name of anti-racism have created for themselves an insoluble dilemma. In the deep south of the USA, in the so-called 'Bible Belt', there still linger on amongst the less affluent whites the old anti-black hatreds that once fuelled the birth, rise and crimes of the Ku Klux Klan and sustained Jim Crow. Tea Party and Trumpist 'poor whites' were certainly not 'powerful and prestigious', though they were manipulated by those who were. Should we then protect from satire their idiocies and hatreds? In this one instance, the consensus on the Left would seem to be no, because, one suspects, those who share them are white and Christian. There were also racist 'poor whites' a plenty in the Protestant farm lands of late Weimar Germany. Under-investment, cheaper imports and a slump in demand had reduced millions of small holders to near destitution. In desperation, they turned to the Nazis, who offered them a glorious future in Hitler's Jew-free Reich. Yet during the Nazi rise to power, Hitler's doctrines were the target of relentless satire by journalists and cartoonists of the left, among them the communist John Heartfield being the most celebrated. But if the critics of the Pen Award are right, in retrospect, subjecting to satire and ridicule the prejudices and delusions shared by the Nazi leaders and their poor and 'marginalised' following was a mistake, the wrong 'narrative'.

Yet there was time when the secular left saw it is their duty to undermine the grip of the rich and powerful on the minds of the poor and weak, what another communist, the Italian Antonio Gramsci, described as the struggle for hegemony, the breaking of the ideological hold of the ruling elites on the masses. Was Gramsci wrong then to combat the delusions of less enlightened Italian workers and particularly peasants? True, Mussolini thought so, because he had him put away for 20 years to 'stop his brain from functioning'. Did not Marx say that the criticism of religion was the beginning of all criticism? Was Thomas Paine generating a 'narrative' for those with 'power and prestige' with his *Age of Reason* demolishing the myths of the Bible? No. The powers that be banned it, as the Nazis burned the writings of Marx.

In their eagerness to condemn *Charlie Hebdo's* satire of Islam, our zealous literary protestors overlooked the obvious truth that all religions, like their secular ideological counterparts, span all social classes, making it impossible to satirise the religious beliefs of the rich, powerful and prestigious without at the same time also satirising the identical or similar beliefs of the poor, the weak, the marginalised and the victimised. In fact, the Sharia left in the UK has arrived at precisely this conclusion and now, especially on campus, vigorously campaigns to outlaw all

critiques of Islam no matter what form they might take and at whom they may be directed. Even in the USA, protected though they are by the First Amendment, still journalists come under enormous and growing pressure, not only from their readers, editors and employers, but politicians and the Muslim lobby, to engage in self-censorship of various kinds when reporting on matters Islamic. At its 2007 convention, the Society of Professional Journalists adopted a set of guidelines to be used when covering stories related to Arabs and Muslims. They included:

When writing about terrorism, remember to include white supremacist, radical anti-abortionists and other groups with a history of such activity; Do not lump Islamic countries together as in constructions such as 'the fury of the Muslims world'; Avoid using word combinations such as 'Islamic terrorist' or 'Muslims extremists'; Avoid using terms such as "jihad" unless you are certain of their precise meaning. The basic meaning of 'jihad' is to exert oneself for the good of Islam and to be better oneself.

Any journalist obeying these guidelines would have to tell lies about Islam, because even the most cursory reading of the *Koran* will alight upon numerous passages which demand that Muslims exert themselves 'for the good of Islam' by waging war on its enemies. (Seeb Appendix L) This was a betrayal of the journalist's calling, which is to report accurately and objectively what a journalist sees and hears, just as a satirist's has for centuries been to struggle against tyranny, injustice, ignorance, superstition and all the other obstacles to human progress and freedom. Together, they have made the world a freer and better place to live in. Now they are both menaced by the Islamic subversion of the west's hard-won right to report and read the truth, its freedom to speak its mind and laugh at what it finds funny and ridiculous. Allah does not like jokes, least of all about himself, any more than did Hitler and Stalin, under whose tyrannies jokes about the great leader could result in death. What price now Voltaire's *Candide*, perhaps the greatest classic of its genre? Once rules are imposed for satire, it loses its true function, which is to use wit and humour to cut down to size the impostor, the arrogant, the fraudster, the charlatan, the pretentious. What more fitting target than Islam, a collection of primitive superstitions that claim to be the summation of all wisdom, a doctrine that sanctifies the inflicting of unspeakable cruelties on especially, yes, 'marginalised' women and, by terror and thought control, prevents access to ideas and knowledge that can lead to the emancipation and the enrichment of their lives. It is Islam, not its critics, that has rendered women marginalised, embattled and victimised, inciting its believers to despise and reject every benefit western civilisation has to offer them. If ever there was a legitimate target for satire, it is Islam, as not only the enemy of the west, but even more so, *as the enemy of Muslims*.

Those who enjoy, to greater or lesser extent, the freedom to speak their minds on subjects that are forbidden in Islamic states, owe it to those oppressed by Islam to undermine its hold any way they can, instead of submitting themselves to a humiliating self-censorship that protects from criticism a creed that both creates and draws its strength from ignorance and fear. Surely those in the west who have access to the public should speak freely on such matters, to proclaim loudly and often what growing millions of those living under the tyranny of Islam think but dare not say. Muslims should be confronted with the proof that their faith has placed those who subscribe to it in the rearguard of human progress as measured by all objective criteria, whatever their theologians might claim to the contrary.

A few statistics to substantiate this assertion. Spain, not richly endowed with natural resources and economically not among the first rank of western states, with a population of 47.5 million, still manages to generate a greater gross domestic product than the entire Arab world, with a population of 465 million. Despised (yet envied) Israel, the Middle Eastern state which lacks the most in natural resources, and with a population of only 9.4 million, generates an annual GDP of \$490 billion, per capita \$58,000. Egypt, irrigated by the Nile, and by far the most populous of the Arab states, with a population of 110 million, 12 times that of Israel, can only generate a GDP of \$400 billion, per capita, \$3,700. Israel's economy is thus 15 times more efficient than that of Egypt. The contrast with Pakistan, a state saturated with, and founded by, for and on Islam, is even starker. With a population approaching 200 million, 24 times that of Israel's, and having since independence received foreign aid from the USA alone totalling approximately \$100 billion, its economy still only generates a paltry annual GDP of \$197 billion, \$1,500 per capita, making Israel's economy a staggering 38 times more productive. Again, not bad for apes and swine.

The divergence is no less great in the realm of academic achievement, as the Nobel Prize awards show. Just as an example, Israel has around 12,000 research scientists, more than the combined total for the entire Arab world. But, leaving aside the ravings of geocentric flat earth Saudi preachers, perhaps the most fitting and revealing comment on the ravages wrought by Islam in the various spheres of intellectual endeavour is the fact that for many years now, the geology department at Cairo University has been closed because the findings of the discipline do not coincide with the descriptions of planet earth found in the *Koran*. Allah has spoken the last word on the subject, as he has on everything else. Therefore, the matter is closed. Yet any informed observer would be obliged to conclude that all for its claims to a divinely ordained superiority, societies governed by Islam, many of them for more than a thousand years, are a total failure in all but one department: the policing of the mind. In the interests of objectivity, let the final word on the plight of the Islamic world be left to a Muslim, Dr Farrukh Salem, a Pakistani freelance journalist based in Islamabad. These are some of the comparisons he made between the realm of Islam and the world of the despised and inferior *kuffar*:

First, economy. Muslims comprise 22% of the world's population, but account for less than 5% of its GDP, a figure that would be even lower but for western aid and imported *kuffar* skills and technology, and without which Allah's oil would still be under the sand and his armies fighting each other on horseback and camels with swords and spears. What is more, this share in world output is steadily declining over time. The combined annual GDP of the 57 Islamic states in 2009 was under \$2 trillion, compared with that of the 'Great Satan', the USA, at \$10.4 trillion. So, with less than a quarter of the Islamic states' combined population of 1.4 billion, the USA, with a population of 328 million, generated more than five times their wealth, which rendered it 22 times more productive. Such statistics as these must surely make more reflective Muslims wonder whose side is Allah on. In 2009, 15% of the Arab labour force was unemployed, and it was projected to double within a decade, mainly because the growth rate of the Arab economies is around 0.5% per annum, among the slowest in the world, while the Arab population has been growing nearly ten times faster.

Moving on to matters cultural, Dr. Farrukh made a no less devastating and damning comparison between educational facilities and performance in the Islamic

world and the west. Leaving aside the quality and breadth of the education offered, the 57 Islamic states between them have less than 600 universities, an average of ten per country, to cater for 1.5 billion people, while the USA, with a population of 331 million, has ten times as many, 5,768. The ratio of scientists to population in the 57 Islamic states is 230 to one million, in the USA it is 4,099 per one million, in Japan, 5,095 per one million. And, of course, we should add that many, if not most, of the Islamic states' best scientists graduate at infidel universities. Finally, perhaps the most damning statistic of all, 800 million of the world's 1.5 billion Muslims, the majority being of course female, are illiterate, compared with near 100% literacy in the west.

The political consequences are obvious. With illiteracy comes ignorance. Ignorance invariably begets prejudice, and prejudice, frustration, hatred, and finally violence. For the minority that can read, the value of such literacy is, as it has been throughout its history, determined by what is available and permissible to read. In the case of those countries dominated by Islam, this amounts to very little aside from the *Koran* and texts extolling the virtues of Islam and hatred of the Jews. Spain *in one year* translates more books into its own language than the Arab world has done *since the time of Mohammed*. Sealed off, as is the intention, from any genuine, objective knowledge of the world of the infidel, the Islamic masses, as was evident in the 'Arab Spring', are all too easily rendered putty in the hands of those who manipulate them for their own political advantage. The result is what we see.... festering, rampant, raging, impotent hatred (and envy) of the west in general and of the Jews in particular, who serve, as always, as the scapegoat for all Islam's many ills.

Fortunately, there is a ready explanation to hand to account for why Muslim states, despite their religion's claim to superiority in all things, are not performing as believers think it should. The answer is to be found in the holy texts, in the Hamas Charter, on Arab TV channels and in the sermons at Friday prayers. It is just as Hitler said...the World Jewish Conspiracy. The remedy is therefore as simple as the cause is obvious, requiring little if any brain power. As Corbyn's 'friends' say in the Hamas Covenant, eradicate Israel, exterminate the Jews, and all will be well. The appalling poverty of intellectual and cultural life suffered by those living under the rule of Islam is not only the product of an unquestioning belief in a faith devised, and then frozen for all time, by the minds of ignorant, barbarian, desert-bound semi-nomadic bandits. It is also the sad inheritance of a culture that has to a large degree been able to hermitically isolate itself from the destabilising effects of conquests achieved by western thought, advances brought about by the dearly-bought ascendancy of free inquiry, reason and science over the ignorance and superstition fostered and preserved by religion. The rulers and terrorist movements of the Islamic world have made it very clear that they do not intend to suffer the same fate as their western feudal and clerical counterparts of a long bygone age. How else is it possible to explain that a state television channel, in the 21st century, is allowed to condemn as false truths that were known to ancient Greece more than 2000 years ago?

There have, however, been exceptions to Islam's self-imposed isolation from the West. Two of its texts in particular have been accorded the rare honour of Arabic translations and wide distribution; namely Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and that Hamas and Saudi staple, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. Two editions of the former have been published, the first, in 1937 in Cairo, translated by Al Sadati and

the second, also in Cairo in 1963, translated by Luis al Haj, formerly Luis Heiden, a fugitive Nazi war criminal and subsequent convert to Islam. Besides enjoying steady sales in the Middle East, Heiden's Arabic translation of *Mein Kampf* is readily available at a number of bookshops in London's Edgware Road, an area of substantial Muslim settlement.

The *Protocols*, a much shorter text and, unlike *Mein Kampf*, wholly devoted to the so-called 'Jewish Question', was the concoction of a Russian orthodox priest at the beginning of the last century. Given the absurdity of its allegations against the Jews, perhaps it can best be described as the idiots' guide to becoming an anti-Semite. Be that as it may, its anti-Jewish slanders soon won endorsement from clerics at all levels of the Roman Catholic Church, and inevitably from the fascist movements that sprang up all over Europe at the end of the First World War. In the USA, automobile tycoon and Hitler admirer Henry Ford funded the printing of half a million copies, while more recently, they were declared to be true by the American 'young earth' creationist, TV evangelist and then convicted fraudster Kent Honvind. The ubiquity and persistence of Jew-hatred has ensured that endorsement of the *Protocols* can indeed turn up in the most unlikely of places...for example, in on-line postings by devotees of former Labour Party Leader Jeremy Corbyn. (See Appendix T)

Nowhere however were the *Protocols* more enthusiastically received than in the Middle East, where they have subsequently enjoyed a uniquely prolific life at the hands of Arab translators, publishers and book sellers. Even in countries where illiteracy was and still is rife, demand for the *Protocols* has proved insatiable, because it has been graced with no fewer than nine editions, more even than the number published by the Nazis. Neither have its anti-Semitic fabrications been lacking in official endorsement. President Nasser of Egypt, President Arif of Ba'athist Iraq, King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, WRP benefactor Colonel Gaddafi of Libya, and the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem Sheikh Ekrima Said Sabri, are just some of the prominent Arab Muslims who have publicly declared the *Protocols* to be true. King Charles' friends and hosts, the rulers of the Saudi Kingdom, are especially taken with the *Protocols*. Prodigious quantities have been churned out and made freely available to all visitors to that benighted kingdom, while possession of a Bible is almost certain to result in arrest and probably worse. The text is used as a study aid for tenth grade school pupils, ensuring that Saudi children grow up hating all Jews, as all good Muslims should. The *Protocols* is not only distributed, often free of charge, in vast quantities throughout the Arab world. Displayed at book fairs, its poison infects not only all Arab states, but the entire Islamic world, as far as Pakistan and even Indonesia. Its slanders against the Jews are regularly dramatised on Arab TV networks, complete with a graphic depiction of the 'Jewish blood libel', in which a Christian child is kidnapped and its blood drained for mixing with unleaven bread for the Feast of the Passover. On May 29, 2015, in one of his twice weekly videoed classes on Islamic theology at the Jerusalem Al-Aqsa Mosque, Palestinian cleric Sheikh Khaled Al-Mughrabi provided a graphic description of how it was done:

The children of Israel would look for a small child, kidnap and steal him, bring a barrel called the barrel of nails. They would put the small child in the barrel and his body would be pierced by these nails. In the bottom of the barrel they would put a tap and pour the blood.

Retribution for this crime was at hand however, administered by a *kuffar*: 'In the end, it reached the point when they [the Jews] were burned in Germany, because of these things, because they kidnapped young children.' When it serves an anti-Semitic slander, the Holocaust can, if only momentarily, become very real. On June 9, Sheikh Khaled explored the theme central to the *Protocols*, as it is to all Jewish conspiracy theories: 'The Jews actually intend to conquer the world, and they began with the holy land...whoever reads the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* will see that the final goal of the Children of Israel is to conquer the world...I mean militarily conquer.' Had he forgotten that this is also the ultimate goal of Islam? On July 31, the preacher revealed to his viewers another traditional Jewish conspiracy, a plot to poison the rest of humanity. But this time the tale had a modern twist:

The Rothschild family own more than half the world's wealth. They [also] own 95% of the world's pharmaceutical industry. Many diseases were created in labs, viruses that were created by doctors bought, trained and taught by the Rothschild family, the Freemasons, the Zionists or [sic] the Jews to create and spread disease so they will be able to sell medicine for it.

With the onset of the Covid19 pandemic in 2020, claims began to appear on anti-Semitic websites that Israel had not only created the virus, but its antidote, which it would then sell to the rest of the world at a huge profit. As for the Rothschilds, their evil doings feature as prominently on pro-Corbyn websites and postings as they do on neo-Nazi ones. (See Appendix T)

On October 16, 2015, at the height of a Jew-stabbing frenzy in Jerusalem, the PA's resident Neo-Nazi preacher mounted the rostrum once again to deliver another videoed genocidal diatribe. Citing, as Muslim clerics love to do, a *hadith*, one of many the Sharia left and the world's media studiously ignore, namely the one which features in Article Seven of the Hamas Covenant, he pledged:

We will follow the Jews everywhere They will not be able to escape us. It is a reliable promise from the prophet according to which the tree and the rock will speak and say, 'O Muslim there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him'. The children of Israel will all be exterminated.

These are not the ravings of a free-lance preacher. The Palestinian Authority assumes full responsibility for the content of all such 'educational' programmes conducted by its clerics. This was made very clear in a statement issued by the PA Ministry of Religious Affairs in the name of its then Minister, Mahmoud Al-Habbash, as reported in the PA daily, *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida* of August 16, 2010:

The mosques and everything belonging to them belong to the Ministry of Religious Affairs, from the employees - the imam, the speaker, the *Koran* teacher, the librarian, the caretaker and custodians. He notes that the religious lessons, Koranic study and other activities going on in the mosque require prior approval by the Ministry.

And funding by gullible *kuffars*.

26 Dump It!

What goes by the name of 'Inter-faith dialogue' is a project intended to bring together, in mutual respect and understanding, though obviously not complete agreement, the representatives of the world's monotheistic faiths and denominations, some of which not only judge all the others to be guilty of heresy but, not so long ago, would have gladly tortured and put each other to death and in some Islamic countries, still do so. How the 'inter-faith' project is viewed by some Muslim clerics was demonstrated in a sermon preached by Imam Hajj Saeed in the Copenhagen Al-Faruq Mosque on February 13, 2015: 'The people responsible for interfaith dialogue want to make all religions equal. They want to equate Truth and Falsehood... This is a malignant idea of which we must be aware, in order to avoid falling into the traps of Satan and his followers, who advocate such dialogue.' Then the Imam gave an example from the life of the Prophet as to how believers of other faiths should be treated:

Our Prophet Muhammed had Jewish neighbours in Al-Madina. Did he call for closer relations, harmony, and dialogue with them... Or did he call them to worship Allah? When they [the Jews] violated their pledge, and did not accept this call - well, you know what he did to them. It appears in his Sira [the 'official' life story of Mohammed]. He waged war against the Jews.

What the prophet 'did', was to massacre the Jewish men, and enslave the women and children. (See Appendix L) This diatribe of inter-faith hate, directed, as is the norm, chiefly against the Jews, was delivered on the evening of February 13, 2015. The very next day, Omar Abdel Hamid el-Hussein transformed the Imam's words into deeds when, after proclaiming on line his loyalty to the ISIS Caliphate, he launched his attack on the Copenhagen Free Speech event at the Krudttonden Cultural Institute, followed by the killing of a Jewish guard outside the Copenhagen central Synagogue.

Saudi Arabia's understanding of the terms on which inter-faith dialogue should be conducted reveals how the same words acquire very different, indeed, almost opposite meanings in different cultures. When the Austrian government threatened to close down the Vienna-based King Abdullah Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue after its refusal to condemn the 1000 lashes and ten-year prison sentence imposed in 2014 on human rights activist Raif Badawi for 'insulting Islam', the Saudis responded by threatening to move the Vienna headquarters of OPEC to another location. The reply of Chancellor Werner Faymann was refreshingly robust: 'If this centre says it stands for interreligious dialogue, then it must do so. But if it wants to remain only an economic centre with a religious fig leaf, then Austria should no longer be a part of it. In any event, Austria will not allow itself to be threatened or blackmailed.' This tells us all we need to know about the relationship between oil and Islam, one that keeps the west's eyes averted from the atrocious human rights abuses perpetrated by the favourite religion of the Head of the Church of England.

A genuine dialogue requires that all participants listen to each other, keep an open mind concerning matters in dispute and, above all, do not resort, as the Saudis did in this case, to threats and blackmail. The *Koran's* Chapter Five, Verse 52,

commanding that 'ye who believe should take not the Jews and Christians as friends', and Chapter 4, Verse 102, which warns Muslims who travel to the lands of the infidel that 'verily, the disbelievers are an open enemy to you' undeniably seem at variance with the spirit and purpose of such an exchange, and certainly do nothing to encourage diaspora Muslims to integrate themselves into non-Islamic societies. On the contrary their message has contributed, along with state-sponsored 'multiculturalism' and 'celebration' of 'diversity', to 'self-ghettoisation', the creation of Muslims enclaves and 'no-go' areas throughout Europe, establishing what are effectively unofficially tolerated mini-Islamic states within states. In the UK, after a series of scandals involving police and social services cover-ups of and even complicity in an organised Muslim sex crime industry, it is at last being admitted that political correctness and fear of accusations of racism, despite Islam's not being a race (though when it suits its purpose it successfully claims that it is) has led to various public authorities turning blind eyes and deaf ears to a vast range of anti-social and criminal activities, including:

- organised gang rape and pimping,
- Sharia law enforcement patrols,
- the creation of 'no go' Islamic zones,
- electoral fraud,
- the Islamisation of state schools,
- organised attempts, one of them successful, to remove the Holocaust from history syllabi,
- forced and under-age marriages,
- local authority corruption,
- self-ghettoisation,
- bogus 'charities' that fund terrorism,
- nepotism,
- the establishment of Sharia courts,
- female genital mutilation (now admitted to be rife),
- bigamous marriages,
- the rape and beating of wives,
- 'honour' killing of girls and young women, (the honour in question always being that of the male),
- paedophilia and the aborting of female foetuses.

Adding to this in some cases officially sanctioned creeping Islamisation of the UK (such as the legalisation of Muslim, but only Muslim, bigamous marriages contracted abroad) are the concessions or privileges afforded to Muslims, and the imposition on non-Muslims of Sharia practices, always without consent and sometimes, in the case of food, without their knowledge, including:

- Muslim-only interest free student loans,
- Muslim-only interest free mortgages,
- Muslim-only free bank overdrafts,
- Muslim-only gender-segregated sessions at swimming baths,
- Muslim-only days at cinemas,
- Muslim-only prayer time at work,
- Muslim prayer rooms in secular buildings and institutions,
- Muslim super-market staff excused checking-out *haram* alcohol and pork products,
- gender-segregated seating at university meetings and in schools,

undisclosed Halal-only menus at fast food chains, restaurants, schools, hospitals, universities and army canteens,
the closure of roads to non-Muslims on Islamic religious festival days,
the blocking of public highways by Islamic prayer sessions,
illegal prayer sessions in royal parks;
and, as a novelty item, the marketing of a Sharia doll, with no facial features.

The absurdity, as well as the perniciousness, of the Islamic offence industry is perfectly illustrated by the following case. An (infidel) couple were travelling on a bus in Yorkshire with their 15-month-old autistic daughter. When she began to cry, to comfort her, they sang the theme song from a cartoon feature, Peppa Pig. A Muslim woman passenger reacted by reporting the parents to the bus driver, accusing the couple of 'racism'. The Sharia-wise driver, knowing full-well how this incident could develop, and perhaps fearing for his job if he responded in politically incorrect fashion by politely telling the woman not to be so silly and go back to her seat, stopped the bus and told the couple and their distraught child they had to get off: 'Just get off the bus, it's not worth the hassle'. We know how he must have felt. He explained that if they stayed on the bus, the police could get involved...and who knows where that could lead. So, singing a song quietly to a crying autistic child became a racist insult to a Muslim woman because the song contained the word 'pig', demonstrating how easily Islam becomes a race when the opportunity to be offended offers itself. If ever there was an incident certain to incite prejudice against Muslims, this was surely it. It also warrants a few more observations on what could be called the Islamic Offence Offensive.

What it seeks at the very least is the same protection for Islam as that afforded to Christianity under the now-defunct blasphemy laws of England and Wales. Dating from the 16th century as the product of a god-fearing, ignorant and bigoted age, they were, incredibly, only repealed on a free Parliamentary vote in 2008. Up to that point, according to a ruling by Lord Scarman, quoting from the *Stephen's Digest*, in the Ninth Edition of 1950, all it required for a prosecution to be brought under these laws was the publication of a 'contemptuous, reviling, scurrilous or ludicrous matter relating to God, Jesus Christ or the Bible, or the formularies of the Church of England'. However the law chose then, and still chooses now to describe it, 'offence' is, at best, a nebulously defined, elusive and entirely subjective mental event, and cannot therefore be subject to any viable external proof or, what is equally to the point, disproof that the claimed offence has in fact been experienced, or indeed, even more to the point, intended. Uniquely in English law, the burden of proof in blasphemy cases necessarily did not so much rest on the accuser, since the law assumed there was a case to be answered, as on the accused, who had to prove there was not. Consequently, the accused faced the near impossible task of proving that no offence had been taken or intended. A verdict of guilty was always the most likely outcome in such cases, and so it proved in the last case tried under the Blasphemy Laws, brought by the Christian TV censorship campaigner Mary Whitehouse against the magazine *Gay News* in 1977.

The Blasphemy Laws in England and Wales have gone, but the crime of giving offence, classified as 'hate speech', has taken their place, and has proved far easier to invoke. Wider in scope than the laws it has supplanted, it now makes possible the prosecution of anyone allegedly causing offence on, amongst others grounds, those of race and religion. The Race and Religious Hatred Act of 2006, although it

specifies that as regards religion, it does not seek to 'prohibit discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, insult or abuse', many prosecutions successfully brought under this law have done just that, since it is at the court's discretion as to whether the behaviour, speech or writings of the accused have transgressed beyond these ill-defined boundaries. The potential, and one suspects, intended restrictions on free speech are enormous. It presents to the professional whinger or grievance-seeker a golden opportunity to take and yes, to seek 'offence' at any comment or encounter which in the slightest way does not accord with their opinions, or display the 'respect' they believe they should be legally entitled to. And, true to form, it is Muslims who have proved themselves to be the most energetic, persistent and resourceful exponents of the art of offence taking, always insisting that the right to free speech (unlike the USA, non-existent in law) must be exercised 'responsibly', meaning that nothing bad can be said about their atrocious religion.

As already noted, one of the problems inherent in legal restrictions on freedom of speech is the impossibility of either objectively proving or disproving whether in fact 'offence' has been experienced or intended. Attempts have been made to surmount this difficulty by devising supposedly objective criteria as to what constitutes offence, or hate, but these fall at the first hurdle of culturally determined subjectivity. Songs about, or images of pigs do not offend atheists, Christians, Hindus, Sikhs or, so far as I am aware, even observant Jews. But apparently, they can have a positively traumatic effect on Muslims. (What I had taken to be a thoroughly 'modern' Muslim girl student I was privately coaching in economic history became distraught when I mentioned pig iron.) So, should the law accommodate itself in this respect to Muslim sensitivities as it has in others, rendering the UK effectively a Sharia compliant pig, pork, gammon and bacon free zone, perhaps even to the extent of banning the words, as Oxford University Press have done? Why not, since Sharia-compliant *halal* meals have been served by the million to unsuspecting infidels in schools, hospitals and restaurants, with the expressed approval of the then Prime Minister, David Cameron.

This obsession with creating categories of the population as defined by what they or others claim are their beliefs, designating them as victims, and then affording them special protection for those beliefs under the law is, by stealth and intention, creating a two-tier legal system, subverting the principle first codified by Magna Carta that there is but one law and all are equally subject to it. The Islamic campaign against free speech, aided as always by *dhimmi* Islamophiles, took what can only be described as a sinister turn with reports in the UK media on February 10, 2015, of police in both England and Wales demanding from newsagents the identity of customers who had bought copies of the post-massacre special edition of *Charlie Hebdo*, and from where they had been obtained. A spokeswoman for Dyfed-Powys Police Authority explained in word perfect Islamobabble that the operation had been carried out to 'enhance public safety and to provide community reassurance.' Despite repeated attempts at my request by Welsh Assembly members to elicit an explanation from the Police Authority as to who ordered this operation, and why, no answer was forthcoming. We therefore are left to conjecture, how was 'public safety' threatened by the sale of a French satirical magazine in the borderlands of mid Wales? Whose 'safety' exactly? Who or what was threatening it? And who was this 'community' that needed 'reassuring'? Given the 'ethnic' composition of the area, it can only have been the Welsh. So how could they, or

anyone else for that matter, have been 'reassured' by the knowledge that the local police were very interested in who was reading what? Not I believe by chance, these unprecedented police intrusions on press freedom, ones that had all the hallmarks of an authorised attempt to appease Islamic sensitivities, came only days after a demonstration by several thousand Muslims outside Downing Street against *Charlie Hebdo's* depiction of their prophet. It presented a petition signed by 100,000 Muslims demanding in effect the enforcement of Sharia blasphemy laws in the UK. All it took was one crack of Allah's whip for a police authority, or possibly even the Home Office, to spring into action. What was particularly humiliating was the petition's praise for the *dhimmi* UK press by not following the example of their continental counterparts in reproducing images forbidden under Sharia law. If the petition's authors' intention was indeed to totally stamp out any public expression critical of Islam, then logically, it would have required, in addition to any domestic restrictions, screening and search procedures at all points of entry into the UK, and the monitoring of the internet, incoming mail and all printed matter, to ensure that texts and images offensive to Islam did not find their way into the homes of UK subjects from countries where freedom of expression still survived.

I do not exaggerate. In February 2021, ex-police officer Harry Miller won a case brought against Northumberland Police Authority. The case arose from a 15-minute questioning by a policeman who, quote, wanted to 'check his thinking' in relation to on-line comments made by Miller on a range of topics. Pursuing the matter further, Miller learned that there was a nationwide policy of police monitoring and recording on file so-called *non-criminal* 'hate incidents', that by the year 2020, amounted to more than 120,000. Details of these 'incidents' could then be forwarded to employers both present and prospective of those responsible for them. Please read this again. Ruling the practice illegal, the presiding judge said it smacked of the Gestapo, the Staasi and the Cheka. In July of the same year it came to light that a man had been entered on the same police file for whistling the theme tune to the children's TV series *Bob the Builder*. The number of actual 'hate crimes', not 'incidents', recorded by the police in England and Wales in the year ending March 2022 amounted to a staggering 155,481.

If, as seems to be the case, our legislators truly seek an 'offence' or 'hate'-free society, then it needs to be understood that it can only be achieved at the cost of abolishing the right to the expression of potentially any opinion, because in this era of global communication, it must be the case that any viewpoint publicly expressed on any subject runs the near certain risk of offending someone, somewhere, somehow. Such an offence-free world will be a speechless world, a textless world, a cultureless and artless world. Then, inevitably this will lead in double quick time to a world in which there will be no beliefs to be offended, and no opinions to offend them...Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*. Is that what we really want, zombification, as the price of not being offended?

In return for all our futile, humiliating and truly pathetic attempts to appease simulated Muslim victimhood, Islam gives the UK nothing, but with every concession, demands more...Sharia geld. So-called (by non-Muslims) 'moderate' Muslim clerics and pressure groups, seconded by *dhimmi* Islamophile zealots like Corbyn, assure us, especially after a Muslim terrorist attack, things would go much more smoothly here in the UK if only we infidels made the necessary adjustments to our domestic and foreign policies. Coming from a culture totally alien to the principles of western democracy, they simply cannot comprehend how

anyone can object to a handful of self-appointed leaders of 5% of the UK population dictating terms to the remaining 95%. And judging by his reaction to the Danish cartoons and the London 7/7 and Manchester terrorist massacres, Corbyn agreed.

We have already listed just some of the many and varied 'contributions' that Islam, as distinct from individual Muslims acting in a non-religious capacity, makes to the UK and more broadly, the entire West. Not just in the UK, but everywhere it goes in the world of the *kuffar*, Islam, with more than a little help from those who are unwilling, unable or too afraid to resist, is managing to impose its alien ways upon societies with which it has little, if anything in common, and to create within them, often with the collusion of public authorities, enclaves where only the holy writ of Islam runs. This is no exaggeration, as the following incident, far from unique, shows. In May 2008, two Christian lay preachers were distributing leaflets in a predominately Muslim area of Birmingham. They were stopped by a 'Community' police officer, who charged them with committing, I quote, a 'hate crime', which carries a maxim sentence of seven years imprisonment, and warned them that if they continued, they would be arrested. Discovering from their accents that the two preachers were by origin from the USA, he unleashed on them a diatribe against US foreign policy, perhaps unaware that he was himself helping to enforce Allah's sovereignty over a portion of UK territory. The officer ended the encounter by offering some friendly advice: 'You have been warned. If you come back here and get beaten up, well, you have been warned.' Another triumph for inclusivity and diversity.

Birmingham, England's 'second city' and the UK's Muslim capital (350,000, 30% are Muslims), was the location selected for an organised Islamic subversion of the city's school system, the so-called 'Trojan Horse' operation conducted by Muslim school teachers. It had been greatly facilitated by the steady flow of Muslim graduates moving on from universities, where as we have seen, entrenched in their 'safe spaces', they form a cohesive and highly motivated body permeated with Jihadist sympathies, into the teaching profession in cities like Birmingham, with their large and rapidly growing numbers of Muslim children of school age. In 2014, an official inquiry revealed that a concerted attempt was indeed afoot to convert many of the city's schools into what were in effect ideological training camps for young Jihadis.

The success of the Islamic take-over was in part facilitated by the then Tory-led coalition's so-called 'Big Society' policy, by which so-called 'free schools', along with other public services, would be removed from the control of elected local authorities and, while still remaining funded by the tax-payer, handed over, in many cases to 'faith' groups, to be run by academically unqualified, religiously-motivated parents and private organisations. Everything seemed to be going well until 2014, when, after parental complaints, the faith school 'flag ship', the 'Park View Academy of Mathematics and Science', was investigated and found to have imposed a hard-line Islamic agenda on its pupils not only in its curriculum, but with classes Sharia-segregated into boys at the front and girls at the back. These findings led in turn to a comprehensive investigation into 21 schools in the city, and a final report which found that there had indeed been a 'co-ordinated, deliberate and sustained' operation to subvert the Birmingham educational system.

Acting on the report, six schools were subjected to a regime of 'special measures', while 100 Muslim teachers were investigated, and 30 removed from their posts. All of the latter group faced the prospect of a life-time ban from teaching.

The report revealed that staff had not only shown pupils ISIS-style videos, complete with masked Jihadis, but had simulated ISIS executions by forcing pupils to kneel as a punishment for misdemeanours. This is how Muslim graduate teachers repaid the UK for providing them with an education and employment opportunities that are, at the very least, not so easy to come by in any country ruled by their faith. Local Muslims, in all probability not only Park View parents, vented their anger at the school's 'de Islamisation' by displaying crucified cats and dogs on the school gates and making death threats to its head teacher. Integration?

The Birmingham 'Trojan Horse' school scandal was only one among many instances of a nation-wide strategy of Islamic infiltration and subversion, often with official connivance and even encouragement, one that was being implemented at every level, and in every aspect of UK society. As the report made clear, these events did not take place by chance, randomly, or in isolation. In Birmingham, fifty Muslim teachers were organised into what they called the 'Park View Brotherhood' in order to co-ordinate their drive to subvert the city's entire school system. Similar operations were underway elsewhere, as was established for example in the caliphate of Tower Hamlets, with its 35% Muslim population, where no fewer than six Islamic 'free schools', the Sharia fruit of Cameron's 'Big Society', were also placed under 'special measures' for their pursuing an Islamic agenda.

These and other similar scandals were the inevitable and totally predictable consequence of a long-standing socially divisive government policy of imposing on the educational system a 'multicultural' segregation of children on the basis of the real, presumed or in many cases, pretended religious convictions of their parents. Cameron's 'Big Society' policy not only handed over schools to be run by Jihadists but allowed them to be inspected by a private (naturally) company that agreed with their ethos and objectives. The firm in question, the deceptively very non-Muslim sounding 'Bridge School Inspectorate', naturally found that everything was as it should be in schools that routinely used anti-Semitic textbooks, where at one, a teacher was secretly recorded telling her class, either 'choose the way of the prophet or the way of the *kuffar*', and at another where the sole female school governor was obliged sit in a separate room out of sight of the board's male members during meetings. Ibrahim Hewitt, the founder and Chair of Trustees of one of the schools passed by Bridge with flying colours, the Al-Aqsa (sic) in Leicester, was on record as stating that adulterers should be stoned to death, that a man should take a second wife if the first was not up to scratch, and that gays were no better than paedophiles. Presumably his prophet was excluded from this comparison.

Instead of the government using education to further the process of integration into society, an objective secular France pursues, if not always successfully, state-funded Islamic schools were stubbornly resisting it, sometimes with the knowledge and even approval of educational authorities. Despite the Tabitha Jamaat Islamic Institute of Education in Dewsbury operating a quite openly segregationist agenda and curriculum, it received a ranking of 'good' when inspected by Ofsted in 2011. The inspectors were particularly impressed by the school's 'outstanding' performance in 'Koranic memorisation', driven by its 'excellent tracking [sic] and assessment system'. Forcing already linguistically handicapped children to learn by heart, in a language that is in all probability not their own, and has no practical use whatsoever in British society, a book that repeatedly instructs them not to make friends with non-Muslims, is child abuse, and should be illegal. But instead, it is praised! Nor was this all. This 'Islamic Institute' had a policy of expelling any pupil

who socialised with non-Muslims, while boarders were banned from listening to music, watching television, using cameras and mobile phones, and from any number of other activities that were deemed 'prohibited in Islam' and, equally to the point, might provide a means of contact with the outside, enemy, infidel world. To repeat: this Muslim ghetto school was rated 'good'.

Another all-Muslim school inspected by Ofsted, (the name of which was kept secret as a matter of policy) in addition to its other Sharia-derived failings, was found to be using religious textbooks that advocated rape, yes, *rape* (as per *Koran*) and violence against women. (ditto). Finally, we have the scandal and fiasco of another Tory multicultural 'Free School' flagship, the grandly named Bradford Kings Science Academy. Launched in 2011, Cameron conducted a high-profile visit to the Academy in 2012, and posed for the cameras with its head teacher, Sajid Hussain Raza. On August 3, 2016, Raza was convicted of making fraudulent payments into his own bank account from grants provided by the Department of Education for the financing of the Academy. The sum embezzled was in the region of £150,000. His sister and the Academy's Finance Director [sic], Daud Khan, were both convicted on the same charge. Each faced the prospect of custodial sentences for what the Crown Prosecution Service described as 'treating public money as their own'.

Islamisation of schools, at taxpayers' expense and with government assistance, was only one facet of a much larger segregationist operation under way. An accelerating programme of Mosque building, largely funded by Arab, and in the first-place Saudi oil money, and the conversion of secular and de-consecrated churches and synagogues into Mosques, was central to the goal of establishing and expanding Muslim enclaves, as in Blackburn, where it met considerable *kuffar* resistance to any more. And no wonder. With a population of 147,000, 39,000 of whom were Muslims, the city already had 47. Bradford, scene of the 1989 burning of Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*, and plagued with Muslim child rape gangs that operated quite openly under the nose of Bradford West Labour MP Naz Shah (See Chapter 27) had 83, Luton, 35, Leicester 55, Manchester 58, London 371 and Birmingham, well on the road to total Islamisation, 165. All told, as of 2014, there were 1740 registered mosques in the UK, of which 550 excluded women, and an unknown, but substantial number of so-called 'house mosques'.

A mosque in a non-Islamic country does not function like any other place of worship. It is essentially a command centre from which to wage a cultural war of infiltration and eventual conquest. Quite apart from cases where mosques have been responsible for (all too genuine) hate preaching and inciting terrorism, studies have shown that their mere presence affects the immediate environment in ways that, for example, a synagogue, Methodist chapel or Catholic church would not do and would not seek to do. The shift is not only demographic. What takes place is a creeping colonisation, in which the mosque serves as the focal point for regulating the life of its largely ghettoised congregation in ways that are designed to render impossible the proper integration of Muslims into the broader society of the host country, in accordance with the *Koran's* injunction, 'do not take unbeliever as you friends'. And there is ample evidence that this strategy is working. The 2011 UK census provided much accurate data on this process of self-ghettoisation. In one area of Blackburn, the proportion of Muslims had reached 85%, in parts of Bradford (Shah's) and Leicester, 70%, Oldham and Luton, 60%, and Tower Hamlets, an entire borough, 38%. These percentages can only rise. Again, this will be seen by

those who, usually from a safe distance, 'celebrate diversity', as proof of the irresistible and desirable march of multi-culturalism. To liberal-minded Muslims trapped, stifled and humiliated by the Sharia-enforced patriarchy of Islamic enclaves, in the first place women, gays and young girls, it is a mono-cultural prison that permits of no 'diversity' whatsoever, one that we have allowed to be created by deference to a culture that has no place in a civilised society in the twenty first century. Those brave young women who try to escape it run the risk of either being 'honour' murdered by their own family or re-Islamised by a forced marriage to a usually much older close family relative in a Muslim country. (See Appendix IV) In one notorious case, a young Swansea-born Muslim woman was tricked by her father into visiting him in Saudi Arabia, where he imprisoned her in a cage to cure her of her western ways, and defied all legal attempts made in the UK to secure her release.

Most migrations to the UK have had a religious dimension if not cause, first of all the persecuted Huguenots, then no less persecuted central and east European Jews. Hunger first drove Irish Catholics to the shores of the British mainland in the 19th century, and Nazi and Stalinist terror the equally devout Catholic Poles in the 20th. Finally, there came migrants from the India sub-continent: Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs and Muslims, each seeking not refuge from persecution but a better life. The integration and in some cases assimilation of these groups has been accompanied by a gradual but relentless generational secularisation – except, that is, for Muslims. In a recent opinion poll, 81% of UK Muslims interviewed defined themselves as Muslims rather than British, and only 7% as British rather than Muslim. And this was after more than half a century of a growing Islamic presence in the UK. For the vast majority, and as we have seen, this applies no less to Muslim politicians, loyalty to their faith overrode all else.

From no other Asian religious or ethnic group - Hindus, Buddhists and Sikhs, Chinese, Vietnamese, Japanese and the rest - do we hear the same incessant whingeing about 'racism', 'alienation' and 'exclusion', and the invention of a word to facilitate the criminalisation of supposed criticisms of their life-style and religion. It is true that with some ethnic and religious minorities, dress styles do have the effect, intended or otherwise, of distinguishing those that retain them from the rest of the population, for example nearly all male Sikhs sport turbans though, unlike Islam, there is no dress code for women Sikhs. However, with Muslims, dress codes are effectively imposed with the full force of religious law only on women, and with a severity that has even involved murder of the offender. The author has witnessed an example of this gender-based sartorial selectivity. A Muslim couple were shopping. The man casually strolled around in *a la mode* shorts, trainers and a brightly coloured T-shirt, while his wife shuffled behind him covered from head to toe in a black shroud, with only a narrow slit for her eyes. This was not a bazaar in mono-cultural Mecca, but a covered market in multi-cultural Swansea. And I have repeatedly witnessed exactly the same scene in of all locations, a Swiss hotel.

Unlike Muslims, other immigrants that have arrived in the UK from the European Union or elsewhere, whether temporarily, for example, to study, or to settle permanently to work, do not create pressure groups that constantly harass public authorities to demand special treatment by clamouring for changes in the UK legal system, or its domestic and foreign policy, and for laws to institute a system of censorship that will protect their beliefs from criticism. They do not put at risk their children's futures by going to absurd lengths to ensure that they remain segregated

from rather than integrated into the societies of which they are, if only legally, a part. They do not subscribe to a religion that demands that they must not take as friends those who do not share it. They do not cry 'racism' or invent terms such as Hinduphobia or Sikhophobia to silence those who criticise or do not share their beliefs. Only Muslims, and the pressure groups that claim to represent them, do all these things and more. Should they wonder that the majority of the public, when polled, say they have had enough? And yet, the reaction to this entirely justified reaction has not been serious attempts towards integration, but yet more whining, offence-mongering, simulated victimhood and privilege-demanding. For example, after the Paris Jihadi massacres of November 2015, when common sense would seem to dictate keeping a lower profile, at least for the time being, instead, Muslims organised a large London demonstration, not to dissociate themselves from the killings by their religious brethren, but to demand special laws and procedures to protect Islam and its prophet from criticism, as if there were not enough such thought-crime laws already performing this function. However, laws to protect the public, including Muslims, from Islamic terrorism were opposed on the ground that they allegedly violated the very civil liberties that Islam rejects because they are defined, enacted and upheld by man and not Allah.

It would be quite wrong to assume that Muslim-self ghettoisation contradicts claims by Islamic spokesmen that they are in favour of what they call integration. This is because, like other such ideologically loaded terms, the word 'integration' can be and is given a meaning totally at odds with its usage in infidel society. Just listen to how the Muslim Brotherhood theologian, Tariq Ramadan, goes about defining the Muslim version of integration. Let us pass over quickly Ramadan's refusal to condemn the stoning of adulterers and move on to what concerns us here: 'We [Muslims] are in favour of integration, but it is up to us to decide what that means'. Henry Ford drives again. Any colour, so long as it's black. Hitherto, integration had always meant integration into another society and to a certain extent at least, another a culture, in the first place by accepting and obeying its laws, learning its language, and at the very least, coming to terms with, if not necessarily embracing in every aspect, the customs and habits of the host culture. In short, when in Rome... Not so with Ramadan. The 'integration' of Muslims will be on their terms, not those of the host nation, more of an occupation than an assimilation, to paraphrase an already cited *hadith* of Buhkari (7296): 'I will abide by the laws of the infidel only insofar as his laws don't force me to do anything against my religion.' In other words, I demand the right of Muslims to create enclaves where Sharia law, and not the law of the land, will prevail. And this is the wish, and even demand, of large percentages of Muslims throughout their diaspora. It has been happening for decades in urban areas across western and central Europe. In 2004, a Muslim woman was stoned to death in *Marseille* for refusing to allow herself to be raped by a Muslim man. Those who claim to speak for UK Muslims habitually dismiss public disquiet at their inability or refusal to integrate as manifestations of racism. They could not be more wrong. Integration of Muslims is the last thing genuine racists want. In the USA, it was a shared opposition to racial integration that led to an alliance between the US Nazi Party and the black segregationist Nation of Islam, or 'Black Muslims'. (See second Addendum to Appendix T).

Save for a genuinely 'tiny minority', public concern over the rise of Islam in the UK and across continental Europe has nothing do with racism, since no comparable hostility is directed towards other minorities originating in the sub-continent or,

for that matter, from elsewhere. The prime cause is an all too obvious clash of *cultures*, the growing perception that Islam is fundamentally at odds with the way non-Muslims conduct their public and private lives, and this includes not only native 'Brits', but all the UK's non-Muslim minorities, be they ethnic or religious. If racism is indeed, as Muslims and the Sharia left claim, at the root of this attitude and therefore, by deduction, not religion, then why is it not similarly directed, with a similar level of intensity, at other non 'white' minorities, such as other 'Asians' from the Indian sub-continent; Hindus, Buddhists and Sikhs, as well as black Afro-Caribbeans, Africans, 'Oriental' Chinese, Vietnamese and Japanese? Whingeing Muslims should ask themselves why Chinese immigrants to the UK have seen no need invent the words 'Taophobia' and Japanese, 'Shintophobia', and those from India, Sikhophobia, Jainophobia, Hinduphobia and Buddhaphobia, or from Iran, Zoroastriaphobia. This inability to accept that the demands, beliefs and conduct of Muslims can be subjected to criticism by non-Muslims, just like those of any other category of persons, is rooted in an unshakable, *Koran*-grounded conviction that Islam is superior to all other belief systems, religious or secular, in a way similar to Hitler's equal certainty that the Germans were a 'master race' superior to all others. By what right, then, so the argument goes, does the inferior presume to criticise the superior, the imperfect, the perfect?

The demand so often voiced by multi-culturalists that nations hosting Muslim minorities must be more 'inclusive', if it is to mean anything at all, presupposes that those who are to be 'included' firstly want to be 'included' and secondly, that they understand and accept that of necessity, they cannot be 'included' into the society of the host nation on their terms, that they will have to make some fundamental adjustments, not in what they believe, but in the way they behave and live. But that is not how it works, or rather is not intended to work, in practice. By UK public authorities failing or fearing to insist on integration (not assimilation) as the essential ingredient of a genuine 'inclusion' of UK Muslims, we have had a so called 'multi-culturalism', the predictable and inevitable result of which has been the exact opposite, ghettoisation on a truly vast and socially divisive scale and not least, a level of political corruption never hitherto experienced in the modern era.

The Pickles report confirmed what many with direct experience of it already knew, that voter fraud and intimidation had become routine practises in certain areas with a high density of Muslims. But this corruption and infiltration extends far beyond the political arena. It includes, of course, education and, perhaps most worrying of all, the forces of law and order. One of the consequences of multiculturalism has been the official encouragement of racial and religious separatism in the police force, the one public service which above all others, should be the most intransigently opposed to segregation of any kind within its ranks. Yet we have a National Black Police Officers Association headed, before being convicted and jailed for corruption, by an Iranian (sic!) Muslim who, judging by his facial appearance, would probably be classified as IC2 by the police's own coding system, but never IC3. We also have a National Christian Police Officers Association, one of whose members was dismissed from the force after distributing homophobic propaganda, and, inevitably, an Association of Muslim Police.

Police in Islamic countries are notorious for their reluctance at best to apply the law when it conflicts with what they consider to be the true will of Allah. In non-Taliban controlled territory, police officers stood by and watched approvingly when young women were stoned to death and burned alive in the Islamic hell-hole that is

Afghanistan. We have the case, still pending at the time of writing, of Pakistan police officer Abubakar Khuda Bakhsh. Bakhsh headed a special unit charged with investigating the 'honour killing' in Pakistan of a British subject, Bradford-born Samia Shahid, by her former husband, Chaudhry Shakeel, who before strangling his victim, raped her. Thousands of 'honour killings' go unpunished in Pakistan each year, but since this case had a British dimension, the authorities evidently felt a proper investigation had to be conducted. Samia Shahid's 'crime' had been to divorce Shakeel, her cousin, whom she had been pressured into marrying, and then compound her sin by marrying a man from a different Shi'a sect, with whom she then went to live with in Dubai. Determined to restore their family's 'honour', her parents lured her back to Pakistan so that she could receive her due punishment. According to the charges made against him, namely those of suppressing evidence and 'obstructing justice', it was at this point that Police Officer Bakhsh proved where his loyalties lay. Instead of investigating the part played by her parents in the rape and murder of their daughter, he advised them to leave Pakistan as quickly as possible to avoid prosecution, a charge which if proved to be true, would suggest that like far too many Muslims, Police Officer Bakhsh did not consider honour rape and honour killing to be a crime. According to his commanding officer, 'he helped people escape the country who were wanted in the case of Samia. Despite clear instructions, he let them go.' It would be naive in the extreme to assume that Muslim police officers in the UK are immune from the pressures of such divided loyalties, when their consequences have been experienced in so many other areas of British public life, not least when it comes to investigating crimes of a sexual nature within their own 'community', as has proved to be the case in more than one police force.

As for the UK's infidel police, aside from turning a blind eye towards organised Muslim sex crime, FGM, honour killings and forced and child marriages, their attempts to further the politically correct version of integration can verge on the surreal. The prize must surely go to the initiative launched by the UK Association of Chief Police Officers on March 6, 2015, titled, 'We Stand Together'. The idea behind it was well-intentioned enough, even though, as it proved, naive in the extreme. Despite the name given to the initiative, local police forces were instructed to promote not integration but its opposite, 'diversity', with events and 'photo opportunities' featuring police and what were presumed to be local representatives of a mainstream Islam. It might be instructive as to the wisdom of this policy to look at its operation in Luton, once famed for its hat-making (hence the nickname of the local football team, the Hatters) but now notorious for its near-conquest by Jihadi Islam, and a Muslim Labour councillor who rhapsodised over 'my man Hitler'. It is also, not surprisingly, also the home town of Tommy Robinson and the birthplace of the English Defence League. What follows could be described, after Lewis Carroll, as the Mad Hatters Sharia Party, or, better still, Allah in Blunderland.

To promote 'diversity' (again, be it noted, not integration, now a dirty word) in the town, a local police officer was photographed with Qadeer Baksh, Chairman of the Luton Islamic Centre, perhaps not being aware that the cleric standing next to him, far from being an advocate of 'diversity', quite openly advocated the death penalty for homosexuals, itself a potential offence under the UK's hate speech laws. (As will be related in more detail below, a Christian preacher in Taunton read out in public a passage from Leviticus saying pretty much the same thing, but instead of a photo opportunity with a policeman, he was arrested by one, charged with 'hate

speech', and convicted before a Muslim judge whose religion imposes the death penalty for homosexual acts...again, a case of you couldn't make it up.) We have not finished with Baksh's Islamic version of 'diversity'. His Islamic Centre had a website, titled 'Call to Islam', which specialised in promoting Nazi-style anti-Semitic propaganda: 'We ask Allah that He grant us the ability to pursue the proper means for gaining victory over the Jews and over the rest of the enemies of Islam.' There are reasonable legal grounds for suspecting that these 'proper means', if successfully 'pursued' personally by Qadeer Baksh, would have required his arrest on a charge of multiple murder, possibly by the policeman standing next to him in the photo. Like most Islamic clerics, Baksh had a real problem with Jews, for his website could not resist introducing its Muslim readers into the secret workings of the World Jewish Conspiracy:

The Jews strive their utmost to corrupt the beliefs, morals, and manners of the Muslims the Jews scheme and crave after possessing the Muslim lands, as well the lands of others. They have fulfilled some of their plans and continue striving hard to implement the rest of them. Even though they do engage the Muslims in warfare involving strength and arms and have occupied some of their lands, they also fight them by spreading destructive thoughts, beliefs and ideologies, such as Freemasonry, Qadianism, Bahaism, Teejaanism and others, seeking the support of the Christians and others, in order to fulfil their objectives.

The list of those who were to be denied the blessings of 'diversity' was certainly comprehensive, even if the identity of some of those to be excluded might not be familiar to everyone. But we get the idea. Whatever it might have meant to the Association of Senior Police Officers, 'diversity' to Qadeer Baksh was Orwellian Shariaspeak for the exclusion of everyone who was not his kind of Muslim. Featured in another group photo with police officers was Ashuk Ahmed, the recipient of a Queen's Honour for his work as a Luton 'community leader'. In this capacity, he served as the 'Equality and Diversity [sic] Officer' for the Bedfordshire Police Authority until, early in 2015, he was discreetly asked to resign. It transpired that like his colleague Qadeer Baksh, diversity for Ashuk Ahmed had its limits. And, also like Baksh, and so many other Muslim clerics, he gave every indication of being an avid reader of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, posting on social media a faked picture of Israeli politicians drinking the blood of Palestinian children, being of the same genre that proliferated on Corbynista websites. According to Ahmed, all of Britain's political parties were in the grip of their 'Zionist paymasters', while the USA had been taken over by 'the Jewish Ashkenazi tribe'.

It is not known whether, in the light of Ahmed's public slanders against the Jews, the Queen withdrew her award for his services to 'Equality and Diversity', but it would seem they did not impede his progress in the political arena. Notwithstanding Ahmed's belief that the Liberal Democrats, like all other UK parties, were in the grip of their 'Zionist paymasters', he had been an active member of this party for twenty years, rising in its ranks high enough to be adopted as its Parliamentary candidate for Luton South in the May 2015 General Election. The seat had a large Muslim population, so the calculation could possibly have been that his well-advertised anti-Semitism would win him more votes than it lost. It is also reasonable to assume, despite his adopted party label of convenience, that following the

example of some other once aspiring but now disgraced Muslim politicians I refer to in the work, his agenda was that of advancing the cause of Islam's literal theocracy, not Britain's liberal democracy.

While many of those duped into promoting such charades are doubtless motivated by a genuine desire to make Muslims 'feel at home', the results will inevitably further deepen and widen the already yawning chasm that divides the Muslim diaspora, largely through its own choice, from infidel society. In this respect, undoubtedly Luton, together with Dewsbury (See Afterword) and Bradford (passim) probably the most heavily Islamised town in the UK, lead the way. (This story is well told by an infidel native of Luton, Tommy Robinson, in his autobiographical *Enemy of the State*.)

Symptomatic of the dominance of Jihadi Islam in Luton was the sight on YouTube of hundreds of Muslims marching through the town chanting 'death to the Jews' without any fear of arrest for 'hate speech', and the election, at the age 21, of a Labour (sic!) Muslim woman councillor who had previously advertised online her admiration for 'my man Hitler' for his extermination of six million Jews, while the town's Labour MP, Gavin Shuker, saw as one of his constituency duties the promotion of Islam by holding a celebration of Mohammed's birthday in Parliament, even though he had admitted he knew nothing whatsoever about the prophet's life of murder, rape and plunder. Another contribution of the powers that be in Luton towards Muslim segregation and ascendancy came on August 4, 2016, when a public swimming pool announced that it would be holding gender-segregated sessions for what it termed 'cultural [i.e., religious] reasons'. Muslim men had been allotted the 50-metre pool, while their womenfolk had to make do, as befitted their lowly status under Islam, with one only 20 metres long. Also, assumedly for 'cultural; reasons', these Muslim-only doubly (by gender as well as faith) segregated swimming sessions were promoted under the title (this was in Luton, England, remember) *Alhamdulillah Swimming*, in English 'Praise be to Allah Swimming'. I should point out there is no record in the *Koran* nor, as far as I am aware, the *Hadith*, of his messenger taking a dip in a desert oasis, though if the Islamic accounts of his battles are true, he frequently bathed himself in the blood of his enemies, beginning with that of the Jews. (See Addendum to Appendix L) What those who think up and launch these crazy 'initiatives' do not seem to understand, though the evidence is there for all to see in its sacred texts, is that given Islam's unique take on the meanings of 'diversity' and 'inclusiveness', making Muslims 'feel at home' can only be fully achieved by converting the UK into an Islamic state, which is also as it so happens an objective of Islam as part of its final goal of world domination.

As an exercise in putting to the test the consistency or otherwise of the multi-culturalist project, let us reverse the case, and apply the same criteria to a *kuffar* British family in the (admittedly highly unlikely) event of its settling abroad in an Islamic country, let us say Saudi Arabia. Would the same multi-culturalists who 'celebrate' the 'diversity' that Islam has supposedly brought to the UK approve of our British immigrant family's demand to be 'included', but on their own terms, that is, to 'celebrate' their own 'diversity' in their newly-adopted home? Would they support the right of this family to live under UK laws which, among other activities deemed *haram* under Sharia law, permit the consumption of alcohol and homosexual acts between consenting adults? To same sex marriages? To a special school just for UK immigrant children, with their own teachers and special curricula

with, for example, the removal from the history syllabus any negative references to the Crusades and the UK's colonial past? To form or join pressure groups to change the domestic and foreign policy of their adopted country? To send their children back to the UK to stay with relatives in school term time, to ensure they remain true Brits and perhaps to finalise a marriage? To demand that their hosts approve of sending UK immigrant children to Saturday schools where they memorise by rote a book in a language neither of their adopted country or their own...say the Jewish *Torah*? The list of non-inclusive demands could be extended at great length, but let it stop there. We can be pretty sure what the answer from our multi-culturalists would be, and in this case, it would be the right one. When in Rome...or rather Mecca...

There is one particular feature that clearly demarcates Muslims from the majority of the rest of the UK's religiously inclined population, and it helps to explain their priorities of allegiance and the manner in which many Muslims, particularly male Muslims, conduct their private lives. It is their extreme and unquestioning devotion to their faith. A survey of attitudes to religious belief in the UK revealed that whereas only 33% of Roman Catholics and 16% of mainstream Protestants were sure god existed, 88% of Muslims had no doubts whatsoever. How mistaken then, are those, especially our politicians, who try to convince themselves and us, that Islam is a religion just like any other, except in that it is especially peaceful. All the evidence points to the reality that its grip on the minds of Muslims, even in non-Islamic countries, is of a totally different order and extent to that exerted by any other faith, especially in the west, where decades of secularisation have, except in the case of Islam, so eroded traditional loyalties and beliefs that they no longer play a significant role in the lives or political allegiances of those who are nominally counted as believers.

Pursuant to this strategy of creating a parallel Islamic society and state, euphemistically described by multiculturalists as a 'community', increasing numbers of UK Muslims demand the right to be governed by Sharia, and not UK law, a demand endorsed by the *dhimmi* former Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams and, until protests by secularists forced a climb down, by all institutions, the Law Society. This insistence on Sharia law for Muslims is something entirely new in British history, and toxic for our legal system, which since Magna Carta and the reforms of Henry II, has evolved on the basis of the principle, now common to all civilised states, of one law for all, and all equal under the law. Sharia law, by contrast, rejects both these principles, and, in descending order, enforces one law for Muslim men, another for Muslim women, yet another for the subjugated, non-Muslim *dhimmis*, and finally, at the very bottom of the pile, laws which sanction the possession and exploitation of slaves and concubines, female sex slaves by another name.

Like many others who have expressed concern about the extent of support for *Jihad* amongst diaspora Muslims, I have been assured, unsupported by any evidence, that if it exists at all, it is confined to a 'tiny minority'. Even if this were true, which it is not, and we were then talking about, say, one percent of the world's 1.5 billion Muslims, that still gives us around a hundred thousand potential Jihadis within the European diaspora alone, with all the rest presumably seeking only integration and a quiet life. So it is small comfort to know that it took only 19 Muslims to wreak havoc and mass murder in the USA on 9/11, and even fewer to visit massacre and mayhem on Madrid in March 2004, London on 7/7, twice on

Paris in 2015, and in 2016, a Brussels airport and Baghdad market, and just one on the beaches of Tunisia, a Gay club in Orlando Florida, a stadium in Manchester, a park in Lahore and a promenade in Nice. Perhaps it has escaped the notice of those who talk glibly of 'tiny minorities', or a few 'bad apples,' as did Sadiq Khan, before his election as Labour's Mayor of London, that the ratio of victims killed and wounded to Muslim Jihadi is unprecedented in the history of land-based warfare. In the 2016 Bastille Day Nice massacre, without the aid of any explosives or weapons, but simply by driving a lorry at high speed along a crowded promenade, one Muslim, in a few seconds, killed at random 84 fellow human beings and wounded another 300, an atrocity that provoked the normally impeccably politically correct President Hollande to declare that 'all of France is under the threat of Islamic terrorism'. Not Cameron's 'Islamist' or Obama's 'extremist' terrorism, but *Islamic* terrorism. (His Prime Minister, Manuel Valls, quickly corrected this correct statement, making an unsustainable distinction between 'radical Islamism' that 'has nothing [sic] to with Islam' and the genuine article. If 'nothing', why then call it 'radical *Islamism*'?)

Germany's *dhimmi* Chancellor Merkel, as always taking care not to offend Islamic sensitives, spoke in the vaguest possible terms of the need for 'solidarity in the fight against terrorism', her sole contribution having been the illegal admission into her country of Muslims who have then committed acts of terror, including those against her own citizens. EU Council President Donald Tusk if anything surpassed her in Obamaspeak, deploring a nameless 'hatred and violence', while the US President himself, just as he had done after all previous acts of Jihadi terrorism, condemned in the vaguest possible terms 'what appears [sic] to be a horrific terrorist attack.' Horrific it certainly was. But as Hollande said, it was 'Islamic', inspired by a faith that like no other, shapes the lives of millions of ghettoised Muslims concentrated in increasing numbers in towns cities across western and central Europe, numbering, in 2010, some 44 million, six per cent of the continent's total population. It is from this immense, self-segregated diaspora that the majority of the cadres of Islamic terrorism, 'normal', 'ordinary', 'decent', 'gentle' Muslims as their friends and relatives almost invariably describe them after their murderous deed is done, have been and will continue to be recruited. I say 'like no other' with good reason. A UK opinion poll conducted in 2008 jointly by the *Guardian* (yes, the *Guardian*) and the polling organisation ICM found that 60% of the 500 Muslims interviewed wanted Sharia law, enforced by Sharia courts, introduced into the UK for Muslims. In another poll conducted in May 2016, a similar proportion of Muslims believed that religion (obviously their own) should determine the making of government policy, whereas those of other faiths overwhelmingly believed it should not. Even allowing for the usual cautionary provisos as to the degree of accuracy that obtain in all such exercises, such wide support for Sharia law and rejection of secular politics and values amongst Muslims hardly vindicate the picture we are always given of a 'tiny minority' of 'extremists' and a huge, 'moderate' majority that wants to settle down, pay its way, become accustomed to and even perhaps enjoy the British way of life, and is prepared to respect UK laws. (Muslims are overrepresented by a factor of three in the UK's prisons.) Other polls are no more reassuring...that is, if one is not an advocate of multi-cultural segregation, and instead believes that the integration of Muslims is a desirable objective for all concerned. Of Muslims in the 16 to 24-year age group, one third wanted the death penalty for leaving Islam enforced *in the UK* under

Sharia law, while 37% of all UK Muslims regarded Jews as a 'legitimate target', that is, for *murder*. When questioned on specific issues such as Sharia law, the veil, homosexuality, the Holocaust, Jihadism, Jews etc, young Muslims respond in ways that confirm they are invariably and significantly more devout than their parents and grandparents, and therefore more inclined to act on their faith. This is in sharp contrast with other religions, including those with an immigrant dimension, where statistics show the trend has been the exact opposite, away from the devoutness of previous generations and towards indifference, scepticism and, more recently open and total rejection of any kind of religious belief. Islam spectacularly bucks this secular trend; with consequences the west is already only too well aware of.

No less alarming was that 35% of all UK Muslims agreed with attacks on UK civilians. 25% of all those interviewed, not just the young, 'sympathised' with the motives of the suicide bombers responsible for the massacres on London transport on July 7, 2005. 25% sympathised with the assassins of the *Charlie Hebdo* journalists. Here indeed we have 'diversity', albeit one that is lethal in its consequences. And while it true these are minorities, they are hardly 'tiny'. Regarding the Jews, in addition to the 37% favouring attacks on Jews in the UK, 19% denied the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews, while finally, and this should come as no surprise, 56% of Muslims favoured an Islamic boycott of Holocaust Memorial Day. (As we have seen, Corbyn wanted it abolished and replaced with a 'Genocide Day', one of the 'genocides' being Israel's of the Palestinians.) The tendency for young Muslims to be more devout, more anti-Semitic, and significantly more inclined to approve of (and therefore to participate in) violent promotion of their religion than their elders, is not confined to the UK. A Pew Global Attitudes project, conducted in 2006, revealed that 35% of UK Muslims between the ages of 18 to 29 approved of suicide bombing compared with 'only' 20% of those over 30. In France, the percentages were 42 and 31, Germany 22 and 10, and Spain, 22 and 10. As one would expect, all surveys on this subject show higher, in some cases, much higher percentages in Islamic countries. Even so, the results for the UK and Europe are truly terrifying and again give the lie to talk of 'tiny minorities'. In fact, another survey, conducted in 2006, revealed, according to a report, again in the *Guardian* of all places, that 'Muslim attitudes in Britain more resemble public opinion in Islamic countries in the Middle East and Asia than anywhere else in Europe.' And yet it is true to say that no country, possibly outside of Sweden, has promoted multiculturalism with as much persistence as the UK, only to paid back with such meagre results.

One aspect of how little Muslims want to integrate in the full sense of the word is their refusal to acknowledge, as nearly all the infidel world does, whatever its politicians might call it, the reality of Islamic terrorism. Believing, as so many Muslims do, in a world Jewish conspiracy, when polled on this issue, only 17% of UK Muslims accepted that 9/11 was carried out by Muslim terrorists. 45% were convinced it was either the Jews (a conviction shared by Corbyn's fellow anti-Zionist campaigner, the subsequently de-frocked for anti-Semitism Vicar Stephen Seizer), the US government, or both. This fantasy also is also naturally given credence in the Islamic and Arab worlds, even though similar percentages saluted those who carried out the mission as martyrs to the cause of Islam. A similar confusion infests the conspiracy-crazed minds of UK Muslims in relation to the London suicide bombings of 7/7. In one poll, 24% approved of the killings, while an equal percentage claimed they were the work of the UK government. Make sense

of that if you can. Two polls conducted after the Paris massacres of January 2015 and the 'Jihadi John' affair revealed the following:

60% blamed at least in part the UK police and MI5 for the flood of young Muslims travelling to Syria to fight for ISIS

25% sympathised with Jihadi John, the Islamic State executioner;

30% said it was not their responsibility to condemn acts of Islamic terrorism;

Contrary to the claim made by self-appointed Muslim mind-reader Corbyn in the House of Commons on November 18, 2015, that 'the two million British Muslims in this country are as appalled as anyone else by the events in Paris last Friday' (how did he know - had he asked them?):

25% sympathised with the two Muslims who carried out the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre;

32% believed that the massacre was bound to have happened;

In addition:

75% believed that Islam was compatible with the values of British society.

64% felt they had done enough to integrate into British society.

The British Council of Muslims somehow managed to convince itself if no one else that these results were proof that 'Muslims feel British and have a strong affinity with our [sic] shared universal values'. So why not 'Council of British Muslims'? 25% of respondents in the other survey identified with an ISIS executioner and the *Charlie Hebdo* assassins, 30% would not report terrorist activities to the police, and a massive 75% evidently assumed that the 'values' of the *Koran*, with its wife beating, marital rape, sexual slavery, killing of apostates, beheadings, crucifixions, amputations, Jew hatred and the rest, were compatible with the laws and values of 21st century Britain. We must assume that the remaining 25% at least had the honesty to admit that they were not. A poll of UK infidels suggested that those 65% of Muslims who believed they have done enough to integrate themselves into British society had not convinced the non-Muslim public that this is the case. Less than 25% of those on the receiving end so to speak thought that Islam was compatible with the British way of life...but who are mere infidels to judge? A global poll of Muslim attitudes conducted by Pew in 2013 produced the following results: Of the world's estimated 1.62 billion Muslims (the number varies), 1.39 billion believed that a wife must obey her husband, 1.1 billion wished to live under Sharia law, 748 million supported the death penalty for adultery, and 584 million for apostasy from Islam. Yet more 'tiny minorities'.

If it is true, as politicians would like us to believe, that the overwhelming majority of British Muslims are what is termed 'moderate' (a version of Islam not provided for in the *Koran* or any *hadith* be it said, any more than there can more than one version of the two times table, whatever anti-racist maths might say to the contrary-see Appendix B), then this should be reflected in Muslim attitudes towards the Islamic state which, we are assured, is in no sense Islamic. Well now. A poll of the general public, not just Muslims, conducted by the *Daily Mirror* in July 2014, showed 44% of those polled as having a 'very unfavourable' opinion of the Islamic State, or ISIS as it then called itself. Of the two categories that concern us most, those 'slightly favourable' ranked at 5%, and 'very favourable', 2%. A year on, and with the general public now mostly aware of exactly what the Islamic State stood for and did, the 'very unfavourables' had nearly doubled (as one would have hoped

and expected) to 80%, while the slightly and very favourables had also increased (presumably not as our Islamophiles would have hoped and expected) to 6 and 3 percent respectively, giving a total of nine per cent. This nine percent represents approximately 1.5 million British adults. Even if we allow, as we always should in such polls, for a certain latitude of error in either direction, and assume that this figure could be less than 1.5 million, what we still have is a huge number of people who, to one degree another, identified with a regime that if its promotional videos were anything to go by, certainly equalled if not surpassed the Third Reich in the bestial cruelties it inflicted on its victims and which, unlike the Nazis, went to considerable lengths to broadcast them to the world. That leaves only one question to be answered: who were these 1.5 million who identified with such a regime? There can be only one answer. By a process of deduction and simple arithmetic, we arrive at the conclusion that they were approximately one half of the UK's supposedly overwhelmingly moderate Muslim population of 3.5 million. But since all such surveys exclude minors, we are considering here only the attitudes of its adult population of around 2 million, of whom at least half, and I suspect substantially more, approved, to whatever extent, of the existence and activities of the Islamic State. Once more, so much for 'tiny minorities'.

Given that a child's first experience of religion is almost certain to be that of his or her parents, the so-called incubation of Jihadism begins not on the campuses and in the *madrasahs* and Mosques, but in the 'normal', 'ordinary', 'good Muslim' homes of the much celebrated 'tightly knit', 'vibrant' 'community', the same community whose holy book time and again forbids Muslims to accept their *kuffar* hosts as friends. So is it any wonder then, that over time, the infidel host becomes in the eyes of so many young Muslims the enemy, a legitimate target for *Jihad*? There is another conclusion to draw from these findings. Comparing the results of the two polls, the more the theology and the actions of the Islamic State became known to Muslims, the more Muslims identified with it, with some actually leaving the UK to serve in its ranks as assassins and concubines. Meanwhile, as the horrors of the Islamic State became more generally known, the reactions of non-Muslims moved in the opposite direction, with revulsion nearly doubling. What does this tell us about the prospects for Muslim integration into British society? As was to be expected, a Muslim 'leader' attributed this trend, which he did not deny, to the failings of British society, and not to his own *Jihad*-preaching religion. The Muslim Association of Britain (again, not the 'British Muslim Association') adopted the well-rehearsed Sharia leftist explanation for the rise in Muslim support for the Islamic State. It had nothing to do with religion. it was all about anti-capitalism and anti-imperialism. Let Comrade Omer El Hamdoon explain:

One reason may be due to the perception that ISIS [sic] represents an opponent to the west and those who are dissatisfied or disenfranchised with new Tory policies or further cuts and civil rights strangulation [sic- but it is Muslims like El Hamdoon who call for 'responsible', Islam-friendly free speech] are using this anonymous [?] platform to express their frustration.

A note of realism was sounded by Labour MP Kalid Mahmood, who acknowledged that 'within the Muslim community [we] need to look within our own ranks to see how this happening...there are people within the community who need to be looked at'. A look at the Jihadist verses in the *Koran* would not go amiss

either. If El Hamdoon was right, British Muslim support for the Islamic State had nothing to do with approval for its theology or actions but was in essence a protest against Tory austerity policies and western imperialism...exactly what the SWP and Russell Brand had claimed. And if the motivation is indeed entirely secular, as El Hamdoon says, then why choose as its vehicle an embattled terrorist theocracy more than 2,000 miles distant, one whose only concern was cleansing the world of the enemies of Allah? Is that why entire families were making the one-way trip to Syria, to fight against cuts in the UK welfare budget? A sceptic could well reply: But surely there are more effective ways, means that are readily to hand, of opposing government policies than supporting (and even fighting and dying for) a regime that rejoices in raping, beheading, burning alive, and crucifying people, not because they are Tories, capitalists or imperialists, but because they have broken some obscure rule in an ancient book, or have different ideas in their heads from the people who are killing them.

For a start, British Muslims, unlike their co-religionists in Islamic countries, enjoy all the rights of western liberal democracy, rights far too many of them effect to despise. They are not 'disenfranchised' or, at least, if they are 18 or over and they are, it's their own fault or choice, as every UK subject 18 and over (bar certain categories that have nothing to do with religion) is entitled to vote, in other words, to be 'enfranchised'. If they have the vote and, following Russell Brand's advice, don't use it, then, again, that is their choice, and a stupid one. And there are other legal ways in addition to voting whereby Muslims, just like everybody else, can if they choose make their views known and their weight felt, few if any of them available in a state where Islam rules. Instead of enthusing over or volunteering to fight for a regime that murders lorry drivers simply because they can't give the required answer to a question about praying or, as the Islamic State also did in April 2016, executes fifty cement factory workers because they adhere to another version of Islam, they can join a trade union, an opportunity not available to most of the world's Muslim workers. They can also join political parties, as in fact some Muslims have already done, although not always with the best intentions or results...not least for other Muslims. In short, *integrate*. No one is stopping them except themselves, and their self-appointed leaders are only making this more difficult by inventing excuses for their failure to do so.

The most extreme manifestation of this desire to ascribe entirely secular motives to those who volunteer to kill and be killed for the Islamic State is the explanation offered by Malia Bouattia, the Muslim anti-Semite elected in 2016 as the *dhimmi* left candidate for President of the UK National Union of Students. Ignoring all the evidence that the vast majority of these Jihadis come from at the very least comfortable and in many cases, prosperous middle-class families, some being themselves professionals, including even doctors, she claimed that young Muslims had 'no choice [really? 'no' choice?] but to go off to Syria' because they felt 'so disempowered' by 'unemployment' (nearly all the recruits left well-paid jobs) and 'the fact that that education is being privatised and rendered inaccessible' - which begged the question - in that case, why hadn't she joined them? Again, sheer fantasy. None of the recruits to the Islamic State had been denied access to state-funded education, and many had degrees. Far from free education being made 'inaccessible' to young Muslims, Ms Bouattia should surely know, and approve, that Tory Prime Minister David Cameron and his successor, the devout Theresa May, made it their special mission to facilitate the establishment of segregationist

Islamic faith schools at tax-payers expense. And the growing influence of Islamic Societies on university campuses, to which we can in part at least attribute Ms. Bouattia's election, is hardly indicative of any bias against Muslims entering higher education. If, for a moment, we allow that Ms. Bouattia is right, does it then follow that despite its name, the Islamic State headed by its Caliph, Comrade Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, is indeed, as many insist, not in any sense Islamic, but shares the allegedly leftist secular objectives of its UK recruits (for why else would they join it?) and that therefore it is the simply the Middle Eastern equivalent of the UK's Socialist Workers Party?

Leaving aside questions of morality, if only because they do not seem to trouble Ms. Bouattia, I put it to those who have elected her, those who, like their President, no doubt believe themselves to be the cream of what will be tomorrow's intelligentsia, that travelling more than two thousand miles at no little expense and risk in order to cut off infidel heads, burn to death fellow Muslims in a cage, rape Yazidi girls and hurl gays from tall buildings, is not the most effective way of righting wrongs that are on your own doorstep. Picture the scene conjured up for us by Ms. Bouattia: A UK Jihadi is about to slice the head off his infidel captive. His intended victim asks, 'Why are you doing this to me?' The Jihadi replies: 'Please don't take it personally...it's because my parents couldn't afford to get me into Eaton'.

The evidence we have assembled in this work is indicative of an Islamic mind set in which facts, logic, reasoning and just plain common sense give way, if they are present at all, to a fantasy world in which an unknown, but for sure vast number of Muslims believe either all or at least most of the following: that they are superior in every way to the infidel and yet also his victim; that their religion, according to circumstances, can be both a religion and a race; that it permits them to exploit the *kuffar's* liberal values and laws while always despising and seeking to replace them with its own; that the hand of Allah's principal enemies, the Jews, is everywhere but invisible; that there was no Holocaust, and yet Hitler is a hero because gave the Jews what they deserved; that Muslims can say what they like about the evil ways of the *kuffar*, but unbelievers should have no legal right to reply in kind lest they give 'offence'; that to question whether Islam is a religion of peace is to invite threats of, and even actual violence; that Islam is a religion of compassion, but instructs its believers not to take infidels as friends. In sum, for such Muslims, they are not only hopelessly 'out of sync' with the modern world, *they are determined and proud to be so.*

For many young Muslims, the myriad contradictions and inconsistencies which reside at the core of Islam do not repel, any more than did those of its secular fascist analogues their followers in the first decades of the last century. *Au contraire*, we have seen, as in the case of thousands of Jihadis flocking to ISIS from Europe (1,500 from the UK alone), and a series of trials in the UK of Muslims charged with terrorism offences, that they can exert their strongest attraction upon Muslims in the diaspora, in countries where rational thought is the norm. Many, probably most, are or have been university students, some no doubt visitors from overseas, all enjoying facilities and freedoms that simply do not exist in any Islamic state. One might have hoped that the experience of being educated at a liberal western university in an environment of unfettered intellectual inquiry would earn their respect for what the west has to offer to those from other cultures, and that at the very least, it would exert a moderating influence on young men and women who

might otherwise be attracted to Islamic 'radicalism', weaning them from the irrationalities that cripple the thinking of so many of their co-religionists. One might...but one would be mistaken. 32% of UK Muslim *students* interviewed said they personally would kill for Islam...yes, 32%. Not just approve of killing *but do it themselves*. And some of them have, while others have tried and failed, or been caught in time. Some have killed and been killed in Syria, fighting, beheading, raping and the rest for the ISIS Caliphate. So I say again, yes, 32% is a minority but also again, not 'tiny'. And what a minority!

So-called 'Jihadi John', the UK cult executioner videoed beheading ISIS captives, and whom Jeremy Corbyn laughably believed should have been arrested (by whom exactly?) and not killed by a US 'drone' attack, fits this profile to a tee. From a prosperous Kuwaiti family, Mohammed Emwazi, before turning Jihadi, graduated in computer science from the University of Westminster, where hard-line Islamic proselytising was endemic. For example, the week that the identity of Jihadi John was revealed, Westminster University's Islamic Society was due to host a speaker, Haitham al-Haddad, Chairman of the 'Muslim Research and Development Foundation' and a judge for the Islamic Sharia Council, which makes rulings in accordance with the four Sunni schools of law. The event was hurriedly cancelled due to 'increased sensitivity [sic] and security concerns'. Sensitivity? al-Haddad's Foundation modestly claims to possess 'the cure of all humanity's ills', one of these 'cures' being for the disobedience of a man's wife. According to Sharia 'Judge' Haitham-al-Haddad, 'a man should not be questioned why he hit his wife, because that is something between them'. (As with marital rape, wife-beating is also sanctioned by the *Koran*. See Chapter 3) Another was the 'cure' for what Muslim men regard as a woman's 'uncleaness', female genital mutilation, which, according to 'the consensus of all scholars', was '*sunnah*' [proper]. He was no less orthodox when it came to the Jews: 'I will tell you the truth about the fight between us and the Jews, who are the enemies of God and the descendants of apes and pigs.' (Again, as says the *Koran*.)

Partly due to the relentless campaigning of UK-based, but Saudi or Gulf funded clerics, but no less with the connivance of politically correct university authorities, and the support of Sharia left-dominated student unions, these are the kinds of beliefs that were rife on university campuses throughout the UK, not least at the University of Westminster. Is it any wonder that institutions of learning were said to be serving as 'recruiting grounds' for the likes of Jihadi John, and that at least 45% of those convicted of terrorism offences between 1999 and 2009 had attended university or other institutions of higher education? So much for 'marginalisation'. Far from serving to integrate Muslims into UK society, higher education, when accompanied, as it so often and easily is, by exposure to unchallenged Jihadist incitement and recruitment, often serves as a pathway to Islamic terrorism. The answer is, however, not to ban so-called 'hate preachers' from campuses, as some politicians and media demanded in the wake of the exposure of Jihadi John. The last place where free debate should be curtailed is a place of learning. Just as it is wrong to yield to demands from Muslims to permit the adoption of Sharia law alongside UK law, so it would be equally unjust to impose on Muslims restrictions on free speech that do not apply to non-Muslims. So-called 'hate preachers' should not be banned, but challenged in free and open debate. The only requirements that should be enforced in such exchanges are that there should no incitement to acts of violence against named persons, rightly a crime under UK law as it is the USA,

where it is not protected by the First Amendment, and that there be no enforced gender segregation of audiences as practised by the SWP, the LSE, and on one occasion at least, by the Labour Party.

Asim Qureshi, Director of CAGE, a registered charity that officially provides support for Muslims allegedly unjustly accused of terrorist offences, but which itself has terrorist connections and sympathies, would have the public believe that Emwazi, if indeed he was Jihadi John, was made a victim of *kuffar* injustice before he became an executioner. The blame lay with UK security officials who, as it turned out, with good reason, questioned him regarding his known links to terrorist organisations. The masked executioner who featured in a series of highly successful ISIS promotional videos Qureshi remembered as 'extremely kind' and 'extremely gentle', the 'humblest young person I have ever known', a 'beautiful man', a description which perhaps tells us more about the company Qureshi kept and those CAGE represented that it does about the character of Jihadi John. From an early age, he was so prone to violence that he underwent 'anger management' and was later involved in armed 'territorial' gang warfare, before graduating to association with the four failed London Underground suicide bombers of July 21, 2005.

A closer scrutiny of CAGE's *bona fides* as a human rights' campaigner for rights that Islam has made very clear it does not believe in leaves one wondering just why it secured such lavish funding from the Roddick Foundation and the Rowntree Trust, and recognition by the Red Cross and of all people, Amnesty International, which before it went pro-BLM (see Appendix XI) and anti-Zionist (Chapter 9) devoted a considerable, if not the greater part of its time and resources to defending victims of persecution by Islamic states. CAGE, it turned out, was closely associated with members of organisations which not only regarded human rights with contempt, but had devoted a considerable, if not greater part of their time and resources to violating them in the most bestial manner...Boko Haram, al Qaeda and the Taliban to name three. CAGE founder Moazzam Begg was an open supporter of the Taliban, while Qureshi, despite his attempts to present a 'moderate' face to the public, was himself an advocate of the very same full-on Islam put into practice by his protégé Jihadi John, as in a speech to a London anti-US rally in 2006: 'When we see Hezbollah defeat the army of Israel, we know where the solution is, and where the victory lies...It is incumbent upon all of us to support the *Jihad* of our brothers and sisters in those countries when they are facing the oppression of the west.' What happened to *Jihad* as an inner struggle to be a better person?

The prevailing official wisdom is that education and the advancement of bright young Muslims into the upper echelons of the middle classes, helped along by the lavish funding, patronage and promotion of supposedly 'moderate' Islamic pressure groups, will in good time undermine the appeal of Islamic 'radicalism'. If that is the case, why are university Islamic Societies aggressively imposing their Sharia agendas on students unions and even university authorities? The belief that an educated and prosperous Muslim will be a 'moderate' Muslim is founded on another false assumption propagated by the far left, that Jihadism is the revolt of the oppressed, the poor, the 'marginalised', the 'excluded' and the persecuted. If this were the case, why is it then that the Hamas leadership (nearly all living in luxurious exile) are wealthy university graduates, two of them billionaires?

The 'Caliph' of the 'Islamic State', Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, though, according to Obama not a Muslim, held a Doctorate in Islamic Studies no less, awarded by Baghdad University. Research has found that the same is true of the *cadre* of all

other Islamic terrorist movements, exemplified by the graduate, multi-millionaire, father of 26 children, Arsenal fan, one-time play boy and architect of 9/11, the late leader of al Qaeda, Osama Bin Laden. All 19 Muslim perpetrators of 9/11 were western educated graduates, some with PhDs. Every study of this subject has come to the same conclusion: education, privilege and wealth do not co-relate with a so-called moderation, but more often its opposite. Shiraz Maher, Senior Research Fellow at the Kings College, London, International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation, said of 'Jihadi John' that 'he has the rather typical profile of those travelling to Syria - he is middle class, educated and from a relatively affluent background.'

Not only self-appointed government and Saudi-funded 'Muslim community leaders' and their Sharia left echoes, but the entire swathe of respectable political opinion will be turned against anyone who dares to say that everything, yes, *everything* that that diaspora Muslims complain of about life in the UK is entirely, yes, *entirely*, of their own making, and is in no sense the fault of the host nation, whose public authorities have done all and often more than is necessary and reasonable to accommodate them. I am not alone in saying this:

As the lethal cycle of British [Muslim] involvement in Jihadism deepens, so the cries of victimhood grow stronger. The families of recruits to the Islamic State's barbaric regime seem desperate to pin the blame for the crisis on anyone or anything - from supposed negligence by the police to brain washing through the internet - rather than accept any real accountability...all too often, we are told the same story by the families of those who run off to Syria: that it is always someone else's fault... too many of them are inclined to play the victim, condemning western foreign policy or "Islamophobia"...[This is Corbyn's speciality] This search for scapegoats has got to stop...Instead of endlessly pointing the finger at others, the Muslim communities should face up to their own responsibilities. For the fact is that in too many parts of Britain, they have allowed a backward-looking, insular, reactionary Islamic culture to develop, which has undermined social integration and promoted sectarianism. There are many Muslim families here in Britain who, despite having potential access to the freedoms and prosperity of our advanced society, have chosen to cut themselves off for fear of contamination of their faith by disbelievers. That wilful separatism is reflected in a host of factors, such as the increasingly prevalence of the full veil or burka in Muslim areas...Tragically, the message of separatism is re-enforced and fuelled by a network of mosques and Islamic centres in Britain which preach a message of insularity dressed up as purity. Bankrolled by Saudi Arabia, many of them are in the grip of the ultra-conservative Wahhabism that took root in the Middle East in the 18th century...What is so disastrous is that this refusal [sic] to integrate with mainstream British society is leaving young Muslims in limbo...Spoon fed on a diet of ant-Western propaganda and disillusioned by the "decadence" of British society, they yearn for an uncompromising alternative - and Islamism, even in the form of the blood-soaked savagery of the Islamic State, seems to provide the answer...This is a Muslim problem, and British Muslims have to address it rather than abdicating their responsibilities.

Brave words. Especially as they are not those of the English Defence League, but Manzoor Moghal, Chairman of the Muslim Forum. Strong meat though it is, Manzoor Mughal's indictment of the self-ghettoisation of his co-religionists was surpassed in its brutal frankness, anger and frustration by the extraordinary

broadside unleashed, like his fellow Muslim's auto-critique, in the sometimes-non-PC *Daily Mail*, by Dr Taj Hargey, Director of the Muslim Educational Centre of Oxford and Imam of the Oxford Islamic Congregation. It was occasioned by the publication in December 2016 of a report prepared by senior civil servant Dame Louise Casey and commissioned by Prime Minister Cameron devoted to the problem of Muslim segregation, which ironically had been greatly exacerbated by Cameron's own obsession with creating state-funded but privately-run Muslim-only 'Free Schools'. To summarise the report's findings, they are as follows:

Public bodies were guilty of ignoring or condoning 'regressive, divisive and harmful' cultural and religious practices for fear of being branded as racist;

The same institutions have 'swept under the carpet' rather than confront these practices, thereby obstructing opportunities to tackle terrorist sympathisers hate preachers, criminal gangs and paedophiles;

Failure to control Muslim immigration had led to the proliferation of Muslim ghettos in major cities and towns;

A 'right on', that is to say politically correct attitude towards Muslims had led to the ignoring of 'worrying levels' of segregation and social exclusion;

Deep-seated 'misogyny and patriarchy' had created deep divisions between Muslims and the rest of British society';

Muslim women suffered 'abuse and unequal treatment', with only one in five being able to speak English properly, and had been made into 'disempowered second-class citizens' by the 'abusive and controlling behaviour of men', including a 'common acceptance of polygamy' facilitated by such websites as 'Secondwife.com'.

All in all, a glowing picture of the 'vibrant Muslim community' so beloved of our high priests of multiculturalism and 'diversity'. Despite allegations that the report had been watered down on the advice of civil servants, what it did say predictably outraged the self-appointed spokesmen for the UK's Muslims, proof that nothing hurts more than unwelcome truths. Typical was the reaction of the Ramadan Foundation, which while not disputing any of its findings, condemned the report as 'inflammatory, divisive, pandering to the agenda of the far-Right', which, we must then assume, is one of ending the segregation of the UK's Muslims! However, Taj Hargey faulted the report for not being radical enough. While praising its author for having the gumption to 'warn about the devastating effect of mass immigration on local communities' and for 'highlighting the segregation, division and tensions it causes in society', he felt that her proposals to overcome these problems fell far short of what was required:

The truth is that we have to abandon our insane fixation with political correctness because it is damaging our communities. Legitimate criticism of anyone, regardless of race or creed, is part and parcel of a healthy society, but we have been too afraid to apply it. [In fact, not only do we not apply it. Since the enactment of a battery of laws criminalizing so-called 'hate speech', anyone who does can land up in prison.] Until now, the cultural baggage that has arrived with migrants from Islamic nations has been treated as sacrosanct and inviolable. The time has come for Britain to be firm and say: "Dump that stuff or you can't come in." [Bravo!!!] One of the most obvious ways to do this is to tackle head-on the pernicious propaganda of extreme Islam, such as Wahhabism or Salafism, perpetrated in Saudi Arabia and fuelled throughout the world by the country's petrodollars.

Unlike most western feminists, Dr. Hargey has no time for the patronising claim that wearing the burka or other face-concealing garments ‘empowers’ Muslim women or alternatively, is a freely-exercised fashion choice: ‘They denigrate women, are deeply divisive – and to my mind, should be banned. There is no justification for these monstrous garments. Not in religion, not in law – and certainly not in British custom.’ Dr Hargey continues:

I was brought up in South Africa during the Apartheid era, when the races were brutally segregated. My family were forced to live in a separate enclave and I was required to go to a separate school from white people. I detested that vile system with every fibre of my being. Now I live in a wonderfully free country. Yet I sadly see voluntary apartheid taking hold - Muslims deciding that they are better off living among themselves. They are imposing segregation on their own communities and ghetto suburbs - the very things I hated so much under South African apartheid; the very things that Nelson Mandela fought so long to eradicate. Not long ago I spent an afternoon walking around Highfields in Leicester. During my visit, I saw only black and brown faces - not a single white person. If that situation had been imposed by a dictatorship, we would fight against it with all our might. Why should it be acceptable in a modern democracy? [But it is Israel, not UK Muslims, that is guilty of Apartheid.] This isolationist trend feeds on itself: Muslims, especially women and children, are encouraged [and that is putting it politely] to withdraw from the rest of society, to keep themselves ‘unsullied’. [and, we could add while some of their menfolk feel free to sully white girls by gang-raping them.] They are taught that they are ‘superior’ because they are destined for heaven while the *kuffar*, the unbelievers, are not. [this is in fact, as we have seen, exactly what the *Koran* says.] Shut away in their homes, many go day after day without seeing anyone who is not a Muslim. They watch Islamist TV stations and read Islamist websites and so the isolationism is re-enforced.

Hargey believed that tinkering with the problem as proposed by the Casey report would not work. The so-called ‘Muslim community’ could not be reformed, it had to be uprooted, starting with its children:

We have to mix up the population of the schools, so that immigrant groups are never predominant in any classroom. If necessary, we should be bussing people to different schools to ensure this. [This measure would be opposed by a united front of Nazis, white racists, multi-culturalists, ‘diversity’ zealots, Sharia leftists and Muslim clerics and ‘community leaders’.] In some cases, Muslim children who attend state schools make up such a high proportion of the class that they grow up imagining that more than half the country looks and speaks like them. Isolationism and separatism must be attacked and dismantled in every way. We must insist that [Muslim] immigrants get involved in the ordinary life of Britain, for example through sport and other cultural areas to bring the disparate sectors together. [Some UK Muslims have seen sport as simply another opportunity for self-segregation, If Dr. Harvey’s proposal is to work, apartheid-style Muslim-only sports teams and leagues will have to be banned.] Above all, we must accept it is not racist to face up to the nightmare of the failure of multi-culturalism. To claim that some immigrants, because of their origins, are exempt from the common duties of integration - that’s racist. To say that some people, because of their religion or the colour of their skin, can ignore British values of democracy, respect, patriotism, tolerance and equality - that’s racist and irrational. We need to be forthright and robust about this. If immigrants are not prepared to fully integrate into British society, arguing that it means sacrificing their religious identity,

they can head to places such as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, Afghanistan and Sudan. In other words, if new-comers and other immigrants are not happy in the United Kingdom and do not wish to be an integral part of this vibrant democracy, they should leave.

So much for 'open borders' and 'diversity'. Manzoor Moghul and Dr Hargey, for reasons that should need no elucidation, prefer to talk of a 'Muslim problem', whereas as I, as an atheist infidel, direct my attack against what I believe to be in most cases the root cause of this 'Muslim problem', namely a religion. They sincerely believe that the problem with the kind of Muslim they are criticising is part cultural, and part due to a false interpretation of Islam. The first is undoubtedly true, but not the second. As I made clear in my *Preface*, I disagree. Islam itself discourages integration, with the *Koran's* repeatedly instructing Muslims not to take infidels as friends. But what we agree on is far more important, that the behaviour and attitudes of diaspora Muslim often leave much to be desired, and that they must both change.

Dr Hargey was repaid for his brutal not to say courageous honesty by being denounced by 'mainstream' Muslim spokesmen as, to coin London Mayor Sadiq Khan's unhappy phrase, an 'Uncle Tom Muslim'. The last thing they wanted was for Muslims to be treated, and to behave, like every else. And what they wanted and demanded more than anything is what the Law Society and the former Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams said they were entitled to and should have; the legal consummation of Muslim apartheid...Sharia law. *Dhimmi* Cambridge Professor Wendy Ayres-Bennet went a step further, advocating a reverse integration, what she called a 'two-way street', with non-Muslims learning to speak Urdu, and not Muslims, English, which sounds to me more like a one way street. Why did she not propose the same measure to facilitate the integration of other migrants from the sub-continent; that is, for non-Sikhs to learn Punjabi, non-Guajaratis Gujarati and so on? So, Professor Ayres-Bennett, why only Urdu?

27 Industry

‘Those abused girls in Rotherham just need to shut their mouths. For the good of diversity’. (Spoof tweet ‘liked’ by Naz Shah, Labour MP for Bradford West and as of October 2021, Labour Shadow Minister for Community Cohesion [sic].)

Until the Reformation, the power of the Church in English affairs was such that, with the backing of Rome, it was able to secure immunity for its clergy from prosecution in secular courts, the so-called 'Benefit of Clergy'. Even if the crime were one of murder or rape (which it frequently was) the cleric in question could only be tried in an ecclesiastical court, under Cannon Law, with the inevitable and intended result that acquittals came easy and punishments, when imposed, usually involved only an act of penance. Such church immunity from English laws was, from very early on, rightly seen as a challenge to the power of the crown and other secular interests, and was progressively eroded, beginning with Henry II's 'Constitutions of Clarendon' of 1164 and, after further radical limitations by Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, finally abolished by Parliament in 1827. In a quirk of history, Henry II's first attempt to establish a single, unified system of law 'common' to the entire realm (hence 'Common Law') was challenged by one of Sharia law advocate Rowan Williams' predecessors, Thomas a Becket, who paid for his defence of what was termed the 'criminous clergy' by his so-called (by T.S. Eliot) 'Murder in the Cathedral' in 1170.

By its current policy of protecting clergy who, from time immemorial, have been routinely raping children of both sexes as well as women, the Roman Catholic Church is still living, or rather trying to, in those times when Benefit of Clergy would indeed have ensured that rapists, whether of children or adults, escaped prosecution in secular courts. That this still happens today is not the fault of the law, but of a church that still tries by every possible means to defy and evade it, and what is more, sometimes does so with the connivance of the civil powers that should be enforcing it. But even here, a distinction must be made between its 'criminous clergy' and the claims of Islam. Even at the height of its powers and legal immunities, except in the Papal States of central Italy, the Catholic Church never demanded that the Catholic *laity* be subject only to ecclesiastical law and courts. It was applicable only to those in holy orders. So far as offences committed by its laity were concerned the Catholic Church was obliged to 'render unto Caesar'. The situation of pre-emancipation Jews was obviously very different. Jews living in Christian and Islamic states, and therefore subject to any number of punitive and discriminatory laws, were consequently, unlike the Christian Churches, never in a position to demand special legal privileges for their clergy, let alone ones for their laity. Unlike diaspora Muslims, instead of insisting on the right to be ruled by the laws of Moses, they always demanded the right to be treated as equals under the law of the land. This was first achieved in Europe by the French Revolution, (inspired, so the Hamas Covenant informs us, by world Zionism) when its National Assembly enacted the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of August 26, 1789, abolishing as it did so at a stroke all legal restrictions imposed on the Jews by the Catholic Church and the Bourbon Monarchy. The demand of the Jews for equality before the law was effected in two Articles: Article 1: 'Men are born free

and remain equal in rights', and in Article 10: 'No one shall be disquieted on account of his opinions, including his religious views'. In these few words, a thousand years and more of pitiless legal and clerical persecution as well as, from the 16th entry onwards, segregation were undone. It is, of course, impossible to legislate out of existence the prejudices of those reared on such deeply ingrained bigotry, as the Labour Party's anti-Semitic scandal has once again demonstrated. Northern Ireland and the Balkans are also sad testimony of this fact. But the French and American Revolutions proved it is possible to deny them a voice in the laws of the land, enabling the Jews, despite their remaining the accursed of Christianity and Islam, to take their first step along the often-tortuous path of genuine emancipation. Perhaps this helps to explain why Hamas decries the French Revolution as the work of a Zionist conspiracy.

Unlike the majority of diaspora Muslims today, not even the most influential Christian Churches, and certainly not Jews, Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, Zoroastrians or followers of any other religion save Islam, have ever demanded, either in the UK or anywhere else where they find themselves in a minority, that not only their clergy, but here is the rub, their *laity*, should be subject only to their religion's laws, and not those of the host nation, and moreover, have had as their ultimate objective the replacement of the existing legal system by their own. Only Islam makes such an outrageous demand and, what is more, one that is treated sympathetically in ways that would never be entertained if made by any other faith, the most notorious instance being that of the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams. He argued that by incorporating parts of Sharia law into the UK's legal system, a development which he anyway regarded as 'inevitable', it would avoid having to confront Muslims with the 'stark alternatives of cultural loyalty or state loyalty.' (The former secularists of the SWP agreed with Williams in respect of one law, the one outlawing FGM.) The question naturally arises – which Islamic laws did the archbishop have in mind? Those that permit wife beating and marital rape? The killing of apostates? Bigamy? Child marriage? Slavery? The rape of infidel concubines? Female genital mutilation? Would these laws, if introduced, be only applicable to Muslims, thereby creating two parallel legal systems, each with their own courts, judges, police, prisons etc, or would they apply to the entire UK population, thereby rendering null and void a battery of laws that over centuries, have created a legal system that treats men and women as equals, and protects children from sexual abuse? And surely, in the interests of 'diversity' and 'inclusiveness', if the UK should incorporate into its legal system the laws of Islam, why not also those of every other religion on our planet?

Insulating itself from what it sees as a hostile infidel world, Islam in the UK, as elsewhere in Europe, has done what Islamic states do on a global scale, erecting barriers to ward off the corrosive and seductive evils of modernity and secularisation. In areas where its numbers have achieved a social 'critical mass', as in East London and cities and towns in the Midlands and the north, its policy of self-isolation, described and decried as we have seen by Muslim commentators in terms as strong, if not stronger, than any of mine, is directed chiefly against those most susceptible to the temptations of western ways, the young. Self-appointed or corruptly elected leaders of these 'Muslim communities', though constantly complaining of Muslim 'marginalisation', do everything within their considerable powers to create as far as possible self-contained Islamic enclaves, with their parallel and rival networks of private and publicly-funded institutions. These

include not only an ever growing number of Mosques, many lavishly funded by Saudi Arabia and other oil-rich Islamic states, but Islamic 'community centres', Islamised 'free' and state schools and government approved private Islamic schools, 'academies', *madrassahs* and 'Arabic Centres', where children from mainly Urdu or Bengali speaking families, instead of improving their mastery of the English language better to equip them for life in the UK, chant and try to memorise the *Koran* in an otherwise socially useless tongue, and can be beaten if they fail. From time to time, staff at these institutions are convicted of physically abusing pupils in their charge, but the actual level of such abuse is far higher than the number of such prosecutions would suggest. In March 2006, Ghayasuddin Siddiqui, leader of the Muslim Parliament of Great Britain, admitted *madrassahs* were operating 'outside the law', with the result that with 40% of staff beating their pupils, as many as 100,000 children were at risk of physical abuse. The same situation obtains with Sharia courts. Again, though many are publicly funded, they impose (mainly on women) Sharia laws that conflict with UK law, while vigilantes enforce the rule of Allah by threats and actual violence, creating Islamic 'no go' territories where, in an increasing number of major European cities, not only infidel individuals, but public employees and even armed police fear to tread. Another victory for multiculturalism and diversity.

In the Islamic diaspora, contact with the infidel is thus reduced to the bare minimum necessary for the internal functioning of the 'tight knit' - a euphemism if ever there was one - Muslim 'community', a strategy greatly and gratuitously facilitated by state-fostered and imposed multi, though in its impact on Muslims, mono-culturalism. This contact, such as it is, is very much a one-way street, with official statistics in a number of European countries, including the UK, revealing a massive and growing draining of resources from the infidel society in the form of crime, welfare services, state benefits, housing, education and the like, while the diaspora contributes as little as possible in the form of tax-paying, gainful employment. This parasitism should surprise no one familiar with the early history of Islam. As we have already seen, it was a creed founded by marauding desert bandits, slavers, rapists and plunderers, origins that are faithfully reflected in the detailed provisions for the distribution of what is called 'spoils' and 'booty', human and otherwise, in the *Koran* and numerous *Hadith*. Trade and taxing also loomed large in the early Islamic economy, which is what would one expect from armed bands astride the crossroads between three continents. Fighting, killing, raiding, conquering, enslaving, raping, looting, taxing, buying, selling...anything in fact except actually making something...these were the occupations, for want of a better word, pursued by the founders of Islam, and they are described and regulated in its founding texts. Productive physical labour and concubinage were reserved for *dhimmis* and slaves, domestic chores and child-bearing for (usually multiple) Muslim wives and concubines. These features are still to be found, albeit in an attenuated form, in all Islamic states and diaspora enclaves, and go a long way to explaining their chronic backwardness and, in the latter, criminality.

Historically, the focus of Islamic economic life in its homelands has not been the farm, mine or factory of capitalism, but the bazaar, the slave market (as in Libya today), plunder and tax, just as its political centres have been and remain the Mosque, the barracks and the palace, not the elected assemblies of the west. Since the Islamic world lacks any tradition or the equivalent of a Jewish or Protestant 'work ethic', and an economy with a free and not bonded labour force, and a

productive, innovative entrepreneurial class akin to a Brunel, Stephenson or Wedgwood, as distinct from the merchant who merely buys (or as in Mohammed's case, the caravan raider who steals) and sells what others have made, should we be surprised then that even today, the diaspora parallel economy still retains some of these essentially unproductive or parasitic features? Unlike its host's economy, that of the diaspora's is overwhelmingly male, located chiefly in what is defined technically as the non-productive tertiary or service sector; at the bottom end, corner shops, restaurants, minicab hire and the like, in the middle, amongst other 'ethnic' businesses, the lucrative *halal* trade, and at the top end, property dealing and the elite professions. Much of its revenue-generating activities are illegal, reflected, as we have seen both in the UK and Europe, in the vast over-representation of Muslims in the prison population. Prominent among these illegal activities are bogus charities, drug dealing, protection rackets, embezzlement, insurance fraud, misuse of public funds, nepotism and large-scale trafficking, grooming and sexual exploitation of under-age non-Muslim girls. In the last, the 'Muslim community', more precisely its male half, exercises a near total monopoly.

Just how politically sensitive the issue of UK paedophile Muslim rape had become became clear when, in July 2007, five years before the issue finally burst into the public domain, a planned televised appeal to the public by the police to help apprehend a Muslim suspected of rape was cancelled to avoid what was called a 'racist backlash', precisely the fear that enabled Muslim men to continue raping non-Muslim girls by the thousands for three decades and more until the scale of the scandal could be contained no longer. Before exploring this sordid subject in detail, let us dispose of the Sharia left red herring that it is racist and 'Islamophobic' (whatever that might mean) to associate Muslim men with organised pimping, trafficking and gang-raping of non-Muslim school girls, because the majority of Muslims are innocent of all three, just as they are of acts of terrorism. True...but also irrelevant. What is relevant is that statistical evidence incontestably proves that both sets of crimes are carried out by Muslims to an extent vastly in excess of their proportion of the total UK population, and it is that immense disproportion which requires to be acknowledged, analysed and explained. As to the first, based on the known religious identity of those convicted of the trafficking, grooming, pimping and rape of mainly underage girls, as we shall see below, of those convicted of these crimes, more than 90% have been Muslim males, while Muslim males comprise less than 5% of the UK male population. So whatever the Islamophiles might say to the contrary, as both Corbyn and the SWP have done, the one factor common to nearly all, if not all, organised gang rape in the UK is...the religion of peace.

One of the first Muslim rape gang operations to be brought to trial plied its trade in Rochdale. In May 2012, at Liverpool Crown Court, nine Muslim men were convicted of a string of sexual offences committed against under-age non-Muslim girls. Sentenced to 19 years in prison, the 59-year-old ringleader of the gang called the presiding judge a 'racist bastard' and claimed, through his defence council, that all the accused had been convicted on account of their 'faith and race'. What had happened to the girls was the fault of 'society', and 'now that failure is being blamed on a weak [sic] minority group.' Poor Muslim rapists. Nevertheless, this 'weak minority group', represented by nine male adults, had for years still managed to groom and then hire out for rape children young enough to be their rapists' daughters and even granddaughters. A middle-aged family man was caught gang raping and pimping children, but, so it was said in his defence, it was society's

fault...a 42-year-old Muslim family man, sentenced to nine years for trafficking, made a girl of thirteen pregnant, his defence being that he thought she loved him. None of those sentenced showed the least remorse. And why should they have done? Sharia law permits married men to take concubines, and permits sexual intercourse with girls who have reached puberty. They had simply enjoyed 'what their right hands possessed'. (*Koran*, Chapter 4, Verse 24) Some of the more recent cases were in Rotherham, more of which anon, Oxford, Aylesbury, Keighley and Halifax. In Oxford, a rape and pimping gang of seven Muslim men was convicted in March 2015 of sexually abusing at least 370 girls, some as young as eleven, over a period of 16 years, again with the knowledge and even connivance of the very public officials whose responsibility it was to investigate, report, prosecute and prevent such crimes.

In July 2015, six members of a largely Muslim Aylesbury rape gang were convicted at the Old Bailey of sexually abusing and pimping two vulnerable young girls over a period of seven years, hiring them out at £25 a time as often as six times day from the age of twelve, to scores of mainly Muslim men. The 'spoils of war' can be good business. It was the usual story of at best indifference to the plight of the victims. The children's charity Bernardos became aware of the abuse as far back as 2008, and 'made a referral to the local authority [but not the police, be it noted] and the relevant agencies'. As in all the other cases of Muslim rape gangs, nothing was done, or, as Michelle Lee-Izu for Bernardos put it rather tactfully, there was 'insufficient action'. Evidently, Bernardos, like the other 'relevant authorities', let the matter rest, because the raping and pimping continued unchecked for another five years. Unusually, David Johnstone, Director of Buckingham's Children's Services (sic) did not plead fear of accusations of racism but ignorance as the cause of his department's complicity in the crimes being committed under its very nose: 'We know a great deal more [now] about children's sexual exploitation than we did back then'.

The reader will in all probability immediately recognise this as the identical explanation proffered by the Roman Catholic Church for its complicity in the systematic abuse by its clergy of children in its care, not just over decades, but centuries. Did David Johnstone really expect anyone to believe that after years of training for and service in an agency whose sole responsibility was to protect the welfare of children, none of its staff saw anything wrong 'back then' as he puts it, or illegal, in the systematic rape of girls as young as twelve, or if they did, none had the duty and authority to prevent it? I do not believe Johnstone's explanation is the correct one. I suspect he didn't expect anyone would either. One can hardly imagine such a relaxed attitude being adopted had their victims been the children of the social workers in question. (One of the two victims had been on their so-called 'at risk' register from the age of seven.) Whatever the cultural and moral relativists might say to the contrary, since time immemorial, any half-decent person has known that the rape of children is wrong, and the laws that say so, at least in non-Islamic countries, are just as old. Those who chose to ignore the plight of the rape gang's victims were not in other respects morally deficient, or ignorant of the laws on rape and under-age sex. Indeed, one of their tasks was to see that they were enforced. The real cause, one that until other similar scandals were uncovered, dared not speak its name, was fear...fear of being branded a racist and an 'Islamophobe' by their friends, work colleagues and superiors, and criminalised by a battery of so-called 'hate speech' laws, especially those of 2005, which were

specifically designed to prevent any serious criticism of Islam; and again, fear, especially in difficult economic times, of losing one's job as a result of such branding. This very same fear inhibited a steward from apprehending the Muslim responsible for the suicide bomb attack at the Manchester Arena in 2017. (See Preface) How else explain that over a period of more than three decades, of the UK's 1.3 million school teachers and support staff, 100,000 police and as many social workers, scarcely one was prepared to blow the whistle on the gang rapists whose victims, in their tens of thousands, were entitled to their protection from their abusers? Avoiding accusations of racism and preserving 'social cohesion' came top of their list of priorities, and the child victims of gang rape, firmly at the bottom. And this was the UK in the twenty-first century, not the Arabian peninsula in the seventh. Had the roles been reversed, with twelve-year-old Muslim girls being groomed and hired out to be raped by non-Muslim men, then back in 2006, Buckinghamshire Children's Services, just like their counterparts in Rochdale, Rotherham, Oxford, Keighley and Sheffield and a score or more other locations, would have experienced no difficulty in recognising child rape for what it was then, is now, always has been and always will be; an abominable crime. We can be reasonably sure that more trials of Muslim rape and pimping gangs are in the pipe line, and now that the game is up for those who have been protecting them, that more will be apprehended and convicted. (I wrote this in 2019. This prediction has proved to be correct. As of 2023, the backlog of those so accused and awaiting trial ran into the hundreds.) The final official report on the all-Muslim Oxford rape gang described in some detail the humiliations and sexual tortures inflicted on young girls by men reared from the cradle on the religion of peace and compassion:

The sexual abuse included vaginal, anal and oral rape, and also involved the use of a variety of objects such as *knives, meat cleavers and baseball bats*. It was accompanied by humiliating and degrading conduct such as biting, scratching, and acts of urinating, being suffocated, and tied up. (Emphasis added)

Of the hundreds of girls abused, six were reported missing 500 times from either family or care homes. As in all the other cases, no investigation as to their whereabouts was conducted, though the reason why they were missing was common knowledge amongst those whose job it was to find and protect them. This included the police. A father who tracked down the whereabouts of his daughter, and found her being sexually abused by a Muslim man, after calling the police, was himself arrested. A victim of Muslim child rape described an identical police practice in Rotherham, in her memoir, titled *Snatched*:

‘Dad explained that he’d been threatened with arrest by the police if he attempted to rescue me from the flat [where she was being gang raped]: “I tried El, I tried...but the police dragged me away in handcuffs [sic]. I was even told they might end up bringing you out in a body bag if I went back there again.” ...He’d then returned to the flat to try and get me out and was handcuffed a second time. [sic] “They took me to the station, threatened me with arrest. I was told that if I went back a third time, they’d’ put me in prison for stalking.”’

Not just local Muslims, but those from far and wide came to rape the girls, while local girls were ferried in min-cabs around England for the same purposes, and with

total impunity, under the noses of P.C. police, brain-dead or brain-washed social workers, corrupt local politicians, un-elected Muslim 'community leaders' and misogynist imams. This highly organised and for its pimps, highly lucrative Muslim rape industry, with its transport network and safe rape houses, operated for at least 16 years in Oxford, unapprehended by imams, police and various other authorities whose responsibility it was to prevent it. The Keighley rape gang consisted of 12 Muslim men, who in February 2016 were together sentenced to a total of 143 years in prison. One 13-year-old girl, put to work serving the sexual needs of scores of Muslim men, was reported missing by her mother 71 times. The police response was to tell her to keep a diary of her daughter's movements. The girl in question, whose testimony in court helped to convict the rapists, was known by social services to be subject to sexual abuse, but instead of reporting this to the police, they suggested she use a coil to avoid becoming pregnant. On one occasion, she was raped by five savages in succession in a back alley. Sentencing the convicted paedophiles, Judge Roger Thomas said they had taken 'terrible and heartless sexual advantage' of the girl. Zafar Ali, a Muslim local Councillor, however begged to differ. He claimed that 'it takes two to tango', implying that this was not a case of gang rape, but teenage promiscuity. There was 'some feeling that the girl had her part to play'. (This was a judgement shared by the Home Office during the tenure of Labour's Jacqui Smith, which in a circular to all police authorities in England and Wales, described Muslim gang rape as an 'informed choice' on the part of its victims.) This 'feeling' is of course the deeply entrenched Muslim conviction that rape is as much, if not, more, the fault of the victim than the rapist, and when the victim is not a Muslim, that it is not even to be considered rape at all, but simply 'the spoils of war'. Another case resulted in June 2016 in the conviction of no fewer than fifteen Halifax Muslims, who between them received jail terms totalling 168 years for raping, grooming and trafficking, in plain English, pimping, under-age girls, in one case, one of thirteen years.

The focus in the wake of these trials was the political correctness which led to the abysmal failure of public agencies to protect vulnerable girls from being reduced to sexual slavery. However late in the day, too late in fact, this was of course true. But political correctness had not been totally dispelled, for why else was there no criticism of those who, by virtue of their position and role in the 'Islamic community', must have known, from its very beginning, not only the purpose and scale of these operations, but the identity of their perpetrators and even of many of their customers? How could such an activity, conducted quite openly on such a scale, over so many years, on a daily basis, by hundreds, probably thousands of Muslim male adults, many of them family men, living in a closed in, almost hermetically sealed 'community', remain unknown to the one individual who more than any other, was responsible for his community's 'spiritual' and moral welfare? We speak of course of the eyes, the ears, and in theory at least, conscience, for what it is worth, of this 'community'...the imam, always ready to take offence at often imagined slights to his own faith, but wilfully blind to crimes committed by those who profess it. This accusation is not made lightly. For all the assurances that these so-called 'Muslim communities' are, like some quaint old English village, 'warm', 'vibrant' and 'close' or 'tightly knit', these and other trials revealed them as ugly, oppressive misogynistic self-generated, segregationist quasi-parasitic ghettos in which all manner of primitive, savage, vile and frequently illegal customs and activities flourish, unchecked and even condoned not only, as we now know, by

public agencies, but without doubt by those with authority within the 'community' itself.

In the 39...yes, *thirty-nine* locations where they have been trials and convictions of Muslim gang rapists, traffickers and pimps, there are all told 747 mosques; 4 in Liverpool, Colchester 2, Coventry 24, Yeovil 1, Dewsbury 31, Manchester 66, Peterborough 8, Barking 1, Ipswich 2, Accrington 3, Preston 17, Huddersfield 15, Sheffield 7, Luton 25, Oldham 30, Blackburn 45, Leeds 26, Skipton 1, Nelson 19, Derby 14, Leicester 73, Accrington 7, Chesham 2, Barking 8, Middlesbrough 7, Bristol 19, Slough 15, Banbury 3, Newcastle 16, Oxford 7, Blackpool 2, Rotherham 7, Birmingham 164, Cardiff 19, Telford 4, Keighley 7, Halifax 10, Rochdale 18 and Buckinghamshire 17. So, we had 744 mosques servicing areas where Muslim rape and pimping gangs had been operating quite openly and with impunity, and on what the Jay report on Rotherham calls an '*industrial scale*', in some cases, for periods of *thirty years and more*. Assuming that each of these mosques was staffed by its resident clergy, it is surely reasonable to ask, how come that with hundreds of pimps and tens, possibly hundreds of thousands of their rapist customers in their congregations, not one imam out of a potential 744 had an inkling of what was going on? And if, as seems more likely, they did, why did they not report it to the police?

Beginning no later than the early 1980s, year after year, tens of thousands of non-Muslim school girls were being groomed, trafficked and then gang-raped on a Sharia assembly line by what must have been hundreds of thousands of utterly depraved Muslim males, the majority of them family men... *and yet not one clerical whistle-blower*, even though they were safe in the knowledge that they could not be accused of Islamophobia or racism. We now, belatedly, demand that Catholic hierarchy be held to account for their acquiescence in similar crimes ...why not imams? And where were the feminists? The metooers? Obsessing about the 'white patriarchy' in the columns of the *Guardian*. Why had no mainstream politician asked these so obvious questions?

Yet the already quoted outspoken Dr. Taj Hargey, Imam of the Oxford Islamic Congregation, certainly had, and he provided the answer that that infidels feared to give. He said that in mosques across the country, imams preached a doctrine that 'denigrates all women, but treats whites with particular contempt'. Muslim men are taught that women are

second-class citizens, little more than chattels or possessions over whom they have absolute authority...The view of some Islamic preachers towards white women can be appalling. They encourage their followers to believe that these women are habitually promiscuous, decadent and sleazy - sins which are made all the worse by the fact that they are kaffirs or non-believers...According to this mentality, these women deserve to be punished for their behaviour by being exploited and degraded.

Should we be surprised then that when asked in 2013 to read out to their congregations a condemnation of gang rape, less than a third of the UK's Mosques did so, with one dismissing the request as 'a stunt'? By their silence, those imams that refused stand condemned, morally if not legally, of condoning Islamic gang rape, according to the principle, *qui tacit, consentire videtur*. No less guilty were Corbyn and the Sharia left who, by denying the very existence of organised Muslim paedophilic gang rape, also helped to protect and perpetuate it. For Labour's

Leader from 2015 to 2020, despite the mounting statistical evidence that proved the contrary, gang rape was a general problem, not a Muslim one. ‘The problem is the crime that is committed against women in any community. Much crime is committed by white people.’ (yes...hardly a surprise, since they make up about 85% of the UK’s population.) ‘Crime is committed by people of other communities as well’. Again, true, but again, totally irrelevant, as Corbyn must surely have known, because the issue was not crime in general, such as speeding, drink driving, murder, drug-dealing, shop-lifting, burglary, dropping litter etc etc or even all those of a sexual nature, but specifically, *organised, ‘industrial scale’ grooming and gang rape*, in which Muslim men, as had been proved beyond doubt by a series of trials, exercised an almost total monopoly, being statistically at least *700 times* more likely to commit this particular crime than non-Muslims. (See below for the proof.) If, as Corbyn seemed to be saying, ‘industrial-scale’ grooming, trafficking, pimping and gang rape of children are to be found in equal measure across all ‘communities’ (again, presumably, as defined by religion) then, according to the 2011 Census, Muslims should account for 4.4% of perpetrators, equal to their ‘community’s’ share of the total UK male population, and likewise Hindus 1.3%, Sikhs 0.7%, Jews 0.4%, Buddhists 0.4%, Christians (and *pro rata* with their various subdivisions, such as Quakers, Methodists etc) 59.5%, those of no religion 27.5% and unstated, 7.2%. Peter McLoughlin, the author of *Easy Meat*, posted on line a running total of gang rape convictions. Updated as of February 28, 2019, of 360 convicted of child gang rape, assuming, almost certainly wrongly, that all those with non-Muslim names were not converts to the religion of peace, at least 307 were Muslims, just under 90% and not, as Corbyn would seem to be implying, 4.4%.

White girls were not the only victims of Muslim child rape. Initially, until their menfolk fought back, *and were arrested for doing so*, Sikh girls were the prime target. Under the nose of Corbyn, in his own Islington North Parliamentary constituency, imams he surely knew personally had officiated at illegal Sharia marriages between children as young as nine and much older (probably closely related) Muslim men, just as they do in Yemen and other Islamic latrines where the law and example of the paedophile prophet holds its misogynistic sway. In the words of the British imam, Bilal Philips (sic), ‘the prophet Mohammed practiced it, it wasn’t abuse or exploitation, it was marriage’. Yes indeed, between a man of more than fifty years and a child of nine. And as the prophet did, so can every Muslim male: ‘Verily you have in the prophet an excellent model.’ (*Koran*, 33:27) By denying what the criminal justice system had proved beyond all doubt, Corbyn was in fact perpetuating the very political correctness that had made Rotherham’s and a score or more similar tragedies across the UK possible.

Bearing in mind that Corbyn had hoped one day to be Prime Minister, and that nearly all these cases occurred in towns and cities with large and growing Muslim electorates, one has to ask, were there no depths of dishonesty, political irresponsibility and sheer depravity he would not sink to in order to remain in good standing with Labour’s Muslim constituency? As the Jay report says, ‘in their desire to accommodate a [Muslim] community that would be expected to vote Labour’, Labour politicians preferred ‘not to rock the boat, to keep a lid on it’ hoping ‘it would go away’. Exactly. According to a study by the British Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences, in the General Election of December 12, 2019, compared to Labour’s overall share of the total votes cast of 32.2%, the Muslim vote was 85% for Labour, 10% Tory, and 5% for other parties. In the General

Election of 2015, with the Jewish Ed Miliband as party leader, compared to Labour's share of the total vote of 30.4%, only 64% of Muslims voted Labour, 25% Tory and 11% for other parties. Corbyn's denial of the proven vastly disproportionate Muslim involvement in gang rape was, ironically, in its turn, refuted in the findings of the reform Islam Quilliam Foundation, published in December 2017, which showed that since 2005, 84% of gang grooming rape crimes have been committed by Pakistanis, in other words, by Muslims, who regarded white girls as 'worthless'.

Chief Crown Prosecutor Nazir Afzal did not try to deny the truth of this statistic - how could he when he had personally brought many of these perpetrators to trial while serving in the North West - but he feared that public awareness of the predominance of Muslims in grooming and raping would facilitate the growth of the far right. If it had done (and there is no evidence that it did), that would surely be the responsibility of politicians on the rest of the political spectrum, all of whom lacked the courage to place the blame for a crime, one that before the emergence of the 'Muslim community' was unknown, where it belonged, with the mysongistic attitude of many Muslim men towards women in general, and *kuffar* women in particular. And had it not occurred to him that attempting to conceal a truth that the public was already well aware of would have had exactly the effect he feared? If he wanted, like Corbynista Labour, to 'keep the lid' on such publicity in future, the only answer would have been for such trials to held *in camera*.

At least Afzal was honest in acknowledging the religious identity of the preparators. He could hardly not, since had been prosecuting them. The same cannot be said of the Socialist Workers Party, committed as it was to its strategy of Sharia-friendly shibboleth-dumping, in this case, the right of under-age infidel girls not to be groomed, trafficked and gang-raped by Muslim men. The SWP agreed there had indeed been a rape issue in Rotherham, but it was a white one, covered up by white police. The *Socialist Worker's* non-reporting of the Rotherham and other similar rape scandals faithfully applied the axiom enunciated by the Sharia feminists Lindsey German and Laurie Penny, namely that white males (unless of course they are converts to Islam) were the worst of all offenders when it came to the abuse of women. Muslim rape and pimping gangs did not exist. It was white men who were doing the raping and getting away with it, because the (white) police were letting them. It was a case of a race closing ranks, and then putting the blame on Muslims. As proof to support this claim, the SWP's *Socialist Worker* of September 2, 2014, quoted what purported to be an unbiased authority, Shaista Gohir of the Muslim Women's Network UK. She claimed that the problem is not the rape of white girls by Muslim men, but the toleration by the police of the rape of Muslim girls by white men: 'The danger is that when a youngster says they have been exploited by a white man, they won't be a priority.' Gohir was in the same state of denial as the authors of a leaflet published in 2010 jointly by Unite Against Fascism [sic] and the Muslim Council of Britain, which dismissed as 'racist myths' reports of 'Asian men "grooming" white girls.' (Once again, Islam became a race)

No-one dependent solely on the SWP, Corbyn the Muslim Council of Britain or the Muslim Women's Network for information on this subject would have had the least inkling that as reported by the official Alexis Jay report, in Rotherham alone, with a population of 109,000, 'at least 1,400' young white girls, mainly working class, had been subjected to decades of sexual abuse by organised Muslim grooming and pimping gangs, or that in one of many cases of police collusion with

the rapists, when officers came across an eleven-year-old girl being gang raped in a derelict house by five Muslim men, they promptly arrested the girl for being drunk and disorderly. (Sexual intercourse with a child under the age of 13, with or without consent, carries a life prison sentence.) Instead, the above cited leaflet purveyed a fable of public authorities in Rotherham and elsewhere who, instead of hunting down white rapists, had preferred to focus on mythical Muslim sex offenders. Everyone now knows that the exact opposite was the case. No white men in Rotherham had been charged with, let alone convicted of these crimes, not because of a police-cover-up, but because none was guilty. As was subsequently established beyond any doubt, the only police cover-up was one that allowed Muslim men to rape as many as 1,400 white girls with impunity.

Consider this. Muslim males comprised 2 % of Rotherham's population, around 2,000. Of these, roughly half fell into the age group convicted of gang-rape, between the late teens and middle fifties. As of 2018, half of this group had either been convicted of gang rape, or were being investigated by the police as suspects for the same crime. Yet Corbyn insisted that Muslims were no more likely to commit child gang-rape than members of any other 'community'. Just how toxic the Muslim gang rape scandal had become for the Corbynistas was demonstrated when Bradford West Labour MP Naz Shah, after denouncing as a Nazi the *Sun's* Editor Kevin Mackenzie for running a story by Rotherham Labour MP Sarah Champion focusing on the identity of the gang rapists, days later approvingly retweeted in good faith a spoof tweet which read: 'Those abused girls in Rotherham and elsewhere just need to shut their mouths. For the good of diversity.' (Shah had previously had the whip withdrawn when she approved an online tweet proposing a Nazi-style deportation of all Israel's Jews to the USA.) When in July 2018, a petition was circulated among MP's demanding tougher sentences for gang groomers and rapists, it was signed by only 20 MPs. Shah's petition against the *Sun* was signed by over a hundred. Please read this sentence again, and then consider its implications.

Thorough as it was, the salient weakness of the Jay report was that in one crucial respect, it too suffered from the same wilful myopia that it rightly saw as an integral cause of the rape gang scandal...political correctness. Throughout her report she refers to the perpetrators as being of 'Pakistani heritage', never as Muslims, which in nearly every case across the UK, they were. Consequently, when she took to task public officials and institutions who failed to report or even colluded with their crimes, she invariably attributed this to a fear of being accused of racism and not 'Islamophobia', a term that for all its frequent (and spurious) invocations in other contexts, on this occasion, never appeared in her entire report, because if it had, it would have identified the rapists as Muslims and not just Pakistanis. In depicting the rape gangs as exclusively a product of Pakistani culture, she therefore necessarily excluded their religious dimension. But the Cologne sex assaults of New Year's Eve, 2015, were not perpetrated in the main by men of 'Pakistani heritage' but by Muslims from a wide variety of Islamic countries. French rape gangs are mainly of Algerian origin, in Holland, Moroccan, in Sweden, many are Afghans, in Germany, Middle Eastern. The common denominator therefore was not that they all share the same ethnicity, but the same *religion*, Islam. For the same reason, Jay also never asked the highly pertinent question; why are these rape gangs composed mainly of men of 'Pakistani heritage' and not also of men from an identical or very similar ethnic background, namely Indian Sikhs, Buddhists and Hindus? Could it be because they are not Muslims? However, while steering well

clear of the teachings of Islam on the treatment of women, the Jay report did reveal that Muslim girls had indeed also been horrifically sexually abused, but not by white men, as the *Socialist Worker* implied. Citing the UK Muslim Women's Network study of the sexual abuse of Muslim girls, the Jay report says that contrary to the allegation made by the Network's Shaista Gohir,

they were most vulnerable to men from their own communities who manipulated cultural norms [sic] to prevent them from reporting their abuse. [The 'tightly-knit, warm, vibrant Muslim community'. The Network's own report found that] offending behaviour mostly involved men operating in groups...The victim was being passed around and prostituted amongst many other men...The physical abuse included oral, anal and vaginal rape; role play, insertion of objects into the vagina, severe beatings, burnings with cigarettes, lying down, enacting rape that included ripping clothes off and sexual activity over the webcam.

And Muslim clerics would lecture the infidel west on its low morals, and the lack of respect shown by its men towards 'their' women? Anyone who doubts the scale of the Muslim rape industry and the degree of complicity of those whose job it was to protect its victims and prosecute the perpetrators, should read the Jay and Casey reports, which are readily available online, as an antidote to the lies of Corbyn and the *Socialist Worker*. Here are just a few samples from the Jay report, which for the first time, lifted the lid (that Labour and Tories alike kept down) on the sexual code of countless male Muslim savages in the UK. We learn that the rape industry in Rotherham, as elsewhere, was closely linked to the mini-cab trade. With a population of 109,000, Rotherham, was serviced by well over a hundred cab firms, and no fewer than 1,300 drivers, many, if not, most, being Muslims:

One of the common threads running through child sexual exploitation across England has been the prominent role of taxi drivers in being directly linked to children who were being abused. This was the case in Rotherham from a very early stage... In the early 2000s, some secondary school heads were reporting that girls were being picked up at lunchtime and being taken away to provide oral sex to men in the lunch break.

Despite repeated requests by various agencies made to the police to take legal action against the companies and drivers involved in drug dealing and various kinds of sex trafficking and abuse, they declined to do so. Need one wonder why? These are just three case reports:

We read cases where a child was doused in petrol and threatened with being set alight, children who were threatened with guns, children who witnessed brutally violent rapes and were threatened they would be the next victim if they told anyone. Girls as young as eleven [one was only nine] were raped by large numbers of male perpetrators, one after another...In two of the cases we read, fathers tracked down their daughters and tried to remove them from houses where they were being abused, *only to be arrested themselves* when police were called to the scene. In a small number of cases...the victims [sic] were arrested for offences such as breach of the peace or being drunk and disorderly, with no action taken against the perpetrators of rape and sexual assault against children...One child who was prepared to give evidence received a text saying the perpetrator had her younger sister and the choice of what happened next was up to her. She withdrew her statements. At least two other families were terrorised by groups of perpetrators, sitting in cars outside the family home,

smashing windows, making abusive and threatening phone calls. On some occasions child victims went back to perpetrators in the belief that this was the only way their parents and other children in the family would be safe. In the most extreme cases, no one in the family believed the authorities could protect them. [Emphasis added]

To which can be added that beginning at the age of thirteen, between 1998 and 2001, just one Rotherham girl was subjected to illegal sexual intercourse by at least a hundred Muslim men, being made pregnant when aged fourteen. Bearing in mind that at least 1,400 girls in the town had been subjected to illegal sexual exploitation, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that most of Rotherham's adult male Muslims had availed themselves of the services provided by its rape 'industry'. Cases such as these proved that for years, in fact, the best part of three decades, Muslim men were free to rape whom they wished, not just under the noses of but protected by the police and social workers, and that everyone in Rotherham knew it, just as they did in other towns and cities where pimping devotees of the religion of compassion plied their obscene trade. And what was the response of the normally anti-police Sharia left to the eventual exposure of the Rotherham scandal? It was to stage a demonstration in Rotherham, not in defence of working-class girls abused by Muslim rapists, not against police complicity and corruption, but...yes... against 'Islamophobia', just as their German counterparts demonstrated against 'racism' after the night of the Muslim sexual assaults in Cologne on New Year's Eve, 2015.

No evidence had come to light in any of the places where Muslim rape gangs have been brought to trial and convicted that similar crimes had been committed by non-Muslims, 'white' or otherwise. So how did this fairy tale come to be taken seriously? Surely even Sharia left credulity (or mendacity) has its limits. And yet, apparently not. Concerned as always to preserve its harmonious working relationship with Muslim pressure groups, the SWP offered its own 'leftist' explanation for what took place in Rotherham: 'Blame cops and the cuts, not "political correctness"' (i.e., ignoring Muslim sex crimes). One is left puzzling: exactly how do cuts in public expenditure turn Muslim men into gang rapists? Maybe it is the same alchemy that we are told transforms them into Islamic State Jihadis.

Much was said, *post facto*, both in official reports, and in the media and by politicians, about the 'failings' of the police and care agencies. Such an explanation would be plausible if confined to one or a few instances in one location. But we are dealing here with highly organised, professional gangs that had operated, supposedly undetected but, so we learn now, protected and even facilitated, in some cases for more than three decades, in cities and towns all over England. We can be sure that still more await detection and hopefully, prosecution and conviction. Official acquiescence in such a multiplicity of identical large-scale operations, spanning such a long period of time, can only be explained by causes that are far deeper seated than the 'failings' of individuals. How come that these 'failings' came to be shared by several generations of tens of thousands of public officials from all over England, ranging from social workers, care home staff, school teachers and council employees responsible for child protection, to elected politicians and high-ranking police officers? No intelligent person, confronted with the facts of the case, will believe that a series of identical responses to a series of identical criminal activities, occurring over a period of up to thirty years, from Rotherham, Keighley, Rochdale and Sheffield in the north, to Oxford and Aylesbury in the south and

Bristol and Cardiff in the west, can be explained in each case by local individual professional incompetence or, as the SWP would have one believe, by cuts in public spending that only began at the earliest in 2010? What we have here are not 'failings', an explanation that itself fails to explain anything.

Allowing unhindered the operation of the Muslim rape industry over decades was the fruit of a consistent *policy*, one not generated independently, locally and 'on the hoof' so to speak by those charged with various public duties. Its nationwide uniformity totally excludes such origins. It can only have come from on high, from central government, specifically the Home Office and departments and agencies responsible for the making and implementing of social policy, and at the bottom of the chain of command, from attitudes and practices instilled into staff which resulted in the toleration of bestial crimes that if committed by white men on Muslim girls, would, once detected, have led to immediate prosecutions.

Here we have the most damning evidence, coming from the very top of the criminal justice system, that these 'failings' were in fact deliberate government policy. Crown Prosecutor Nazir Afzal told the BBC that in 2008,

the Home Office sent a circular to all police in the country saying 'as far as these young girls who are being exploited in towns and cities, we believe they have made an *informed choice* about their sexual behaviour and it is therefore not for you police officers to get involved in.'. (Emphasis added)

'...being exploited', that is, groomed, trafficked and gang-raped, an '*informed choice*'? 'Informed' by what? And 'informed choice' or not, the girls who were presumed to be making it were nearly all under 16 years of age, some as young as 11. The Home Office was therefore *instructing* the police force to condone one of the most serious crimes on the statute book. And who at the time was Home Secretary? Labour's Jacqui Smith. And yet it was Smith who, in the same year, after admitting that she did not feel safe walking the streets of London at night, introduced legislation making it a criminal offence to pay for sex with a prostitute controlled or trafficked by a pimp - unless, so it would seem, the pimp or trafficker was a Muslim. The Home Office instruction to the police ensured that whatever Smith feared might await her on the streets of London, far worse would continue to go unprevented and unpunished in the safe rape houses of Rotherham. But that is far from the whole story. According to Rotherham's Labour MP Sarah Champion, the refusal by the police and central government to prosecute the rape gangs dated back at least as far as 2002, when 'the Home Office knew all about child exploitation in Rotherham', the records of which subsequently and, some might suspect, conveniently went missing. 'How many lives could have been protected' she asked, if at the time, 'swift action had been taken'. As always, 'community cohesion' dictated otherwise. This policy continued under the Conservatives, as a series of trials proved beyond any doubt that as previously, police forces across the country had allowed rape gangs to ply their lucrative trade with impunity. Then, in what many took to be departure from this policy, in July 2018, the then Home Secretary, Sajid Javid, announced that the Home Office would be conducting an investigation into the rape industry, followed by the publication of a report on its findings, conclusions and recommendations. It would be an investigation, promised Javid, in which there would be 'no no-go areas', while he personally pledged that he would 'not let cultural or political sensitivities get in the way of understanding

the problem and doing something about it.’ Brave words, and we can believe that he meant them. But it was not to be. 18 months on, and with no sign of Javid’s promised report, in December 2019, the *Independent* inquired when or indeed if the report was to be made available to the public. The reply from the Home Office, now headed by Javid’s replacement, Priti Patel, was that it was indeed complete, but its release to the public, countless thousands of whose children had been the victims of the crimes which had been the reason for and subject of the investigation, was ‘not in the public interest’. A petition demanding a parliamentary debate on why the report had not been released gathered in a matter of days 22,000 more than the required 100,000 signatures necessary for a government response. The report would not be released, came the reply, for the reasons already stated. What it did say simply echoed what Corbyn had previously said on the same subject, in that firstly, just like Corbyn, it made no mention of trafficking, grooming and gang rape, the original specific terms of reference of the inquiry, speaking only of ‘child sexual abuse’ in general and, secondly, also just like Corbyn, it ignored the religious identity of the overwhelming majority of the perpetrators, instead claiming that ‘child sexual abusers’ come from ‘many different age groups, ethnicities and faiths’. That may be so. But there are no Christian, Sikh, Hindu, Mormon, Jainist, Zoroastrian, Shinto, Yazidi, Taoist, Jewish or Buddhist rape gangs, only Muslim.

Again just like Corbyn, and one suspects also for the same electoral reasons as his, the Tories were obviously concerned to deny any connection between Islam and gang rape. This might also explain why in April 2021, a Tory councilor was suspended after the BBC unearthed a 2019 tweet which said Tommy Robinson had been talking ‘complete and utter sense’ about ‘Islamic problems.’ Defending the suspension, a Tory spokesperson said ‘any form of racism will not be tolerated’. Yes...but saying Islam, which is not a race but a religion, has ‘problems’, is not and cannot be racism, any more than saying the Catholic Church has, or Scientology. There are Muslim scholars and clerics who also happen to agree that Islam has ‘problems’, some of whom I cite in this book. Are they too racists? And did not Boris Johnson back in 2018 find himself in woke water for saying it was ‘ridiculous that people [sic] should choose to go around dressed like letter boxes’? It is those infidels, be they Tories, Corbynistas or whatever, who do not have a ‘problem’ with Islam’s teachings on, for example, homosexuality and the treatment of women, both contrary to UK law, who are perhaps the biggest problem of all. As for the execrable Smith, we have already met her doing her bit for Allah when she denied entry into the UK by the Dutch MP Geert Wilders, who had been invited to Westminster to show his film ‘Fitna’, which with excerpts from the Koran, and sermons by Muslim preachers, demonstrated the link between Islam and terrorism. As the Jay report strongly implies with regard to Muslim rape gangs, here too the decision could have been motivated by the same concern for Labour’s Muslim vote.

There is evidence to suspect that the Home Office instruction to police chiefs to give what amounted to a free pass to Muslim rape gangs was in many cases superfluous, as the Rotherham example, one of many, proves. Here as in other English towns and cities in the Midlands and the north, a (police) ‘hands off’ policy had already been operating for years before it was issued. In an article in *The Times* of January 18, 2020, by Andrew Norfolk, the first mainstream journalist to report on the Muslim gang rape industry, he revealed that ‘a senior police officer admitted that his force ignored the sexual abuse of girls by Pakistani [sic] grooming gangs for decades’. (Emphasis added) The reason he gave for not enforcing the laws on

trafficking, pimping, rape and under-age sex was that his force was ‘afraid of increasing “racial tensions”.’ Norfolk continues: ‘After a five-year [sic] investigation, the Independent Office for Police Conduct upheld a complaint that the Rotherham officer told a missing child’s distraught father that the town “would erupt” if it was known that Asian men were routinely having sex with [no, raping] under-age white girls. The Chief Inspector is said to have described the abuse as “Paki-shagging” and to have said it had been “going on” for 30 years. “With it being Asians, we can’t afford for this to be coming out”.’ The fact that just one incident took *five years* to resolve is surely proof of the complicity of high-ranking police officers, not just those of Rotherham we can be sure, in the Muslim rape industry. So much then for the much-vaunted ‘community cohesion’, which in this case as in many others, came at the price of the gang-raping and brutalisation of well over a thousand under-age white girls in just one town by in many cases, middle-aged married Muslim men. Incredibly, an investigation by the South Yorkshire Police Authority into the conduct of 47 Rotherham police officers in relation to the town’s rape industry found no grounds for disciplinary action against any of them.

Across the Pennines, it was the same sordid story. The *Manchester Evening News* of January 14, 2020 featured a report on the findings of what it described as ‘a blistering inquiry’ into a ‘vast south Manchester grooming gang [that] targeted vulnerable children “in plain sight” of police and social workers, who then failed to protect kids from abuse and even death.’ Yes, even death. And, as in Rotherham and a score or more other locations, ‘in plain sight’ of the police. The report continued: ‘Children were raped and abused by up to 100 [!!!!] members of a grooming gang sixteen years ago, but despite police and social workers knowing what was happening they weren’t stopped.’ Even after a series of high-profile trials in other cities, it was business as usual in Manchester. ‘Greater Manchester Police dropped an operation that identified up to 97 [sic] potential suspects and at least 57 potential victims. Eight of the men went on to later assault or rape girls.’ Yet, ‘as late as August 2018, the Chief Constable’, one must presume still dutifully following Home Office instructions, ‘refused [sic] to reopen the dropped operation.’ It strains all but the crassest credulity beyond breaking point that for decades, this and other identical scandals across England went unnoticed by the Home Office, the criminal justice system, the College of Police and the National Police Chiefs Council...and, until the *Times* broke ranks, the mainstream media.

The degree of Manchester police complicity in the city’s rape industry initially came to light in 2012, as a result of the trial and conviction of nine Muslim men, aged between 24 and 59, on charges of rape, sex trafficking and conspiracy to engage in sexual activity with a child. The charges related to the sexual abuse of underage girls that took place in Rochdale in 2008 and 2009. A number of media investigations revealed that beginning as far back as 2003, Sara Rowbotham, Team Co-ordinator of the Rochdale Crisis Intervention Team, made more than 180 (repeat, 180) attempts to alert the police and other public authorities to the activities of rape gangs, but to no effect, the excuse of the Crown Prosecution Service being that the witnesses (the girls who had been raped) were not reliable. This is not the procedure followed in ‘normal’ rape cases, where all such allegations are taken seriously and acted upon. Maybe in deference to the religious identity of the accused, in conformity with Sharia law, the CPS was waiting for four adult Muslim male witnesses to come forward.

In a TV documentary on the Rochdale scandal, Ann Cryer, the local (Labour) MP, said she tried to persuade local Muslim leaders, including a councillor and some Elders, to 'go knocking on doors and say "this behaviour is un-Islamic, and I want it to stop because I'm going to tell the whole [Muslim] community about you and what you're doing if you don't." Now they weren't prepared to do that.' Maybe it was because the 'behaviour' in question was not quite as un-Islamic as she thought. She had also been 'round the police station virtually every week', 'begging' the police to take action against the rape gangs, but 'neither the police nor social services would touch these cases. I think it was because they were afraid of being called racist.' So...yet again. And obviously more so than being accused of facilitating the mass rape of children. And I do mean mass. Largely from dysfunctional backgrounds and many living in care homes, hooked on drugs and often as not drunk when abused, the girls were routinely raped on an assembly line by as many as five men in succession, one girl by 20. One 13-year-old girl had an abortion after being made pregnant by a rapist. One 15-year-old girl was awarded by a trafficker to another gang member as a birthday present, who then raped her.

All this and more took place under the noses of Manchester social services, police and justice (sic) system, just as it did in Rotherham where, as recorded by the Casey report, under-aged girls were being gang-raped, 'on an industrial scale' round the clock, 24-7, in their hundreds. Yet in the 16 years between 1997 and 2013, the town's police managed to secure only five convictions for sexual offences against children...an average of 0.31 per annum. (But perhaps I am being too harsh, because the Rotherham conviction rate was exactly ten times higher than the CPS's for another crime with an Islamic dimension, Female Genital Mutilation. With a jurisdiction not just over a town with a population of 100,000, but over England and Wales, with one of 56 million, in the 35 years since it was outlawed in 1985, the CPS, with a staff of 6,000, had secured one successful prosecution for FGM, a crime no less rife, vile and misogynistic than gang rape. One conviction in 35 years works out at 0.029 per annum.) As the Jay report tells it, two opportunities to effect an arrest and conviction for gang rape in Rotherham occurred when 'fathers tracked down their daughters and tried to remove them from houses where they were being abused'. Arrests did indeed take place when the police were called to the scene... but of the fathers, not the rapists.

In both Rotherham and Manchester, collusion was not confined to the police and the justice system and, until the *Times* broke ranks, the silent media. There was also the part played by elected politicians and departments of local authorities for which they were responsible, which included erecting a protective wall around a thriving child rape industry. In Rotherham, such was the extent of collusion by the town's Labour council and officials in the sexual abuse of young girls revealed by the Casey and Jay reports that in August 2015, the government issued a statement headed 'Rotherham's State of Denial'. It declared that as there was no 'reasonable prospect of Rotherham putting its own house in order', 'the Secretary of State [for Communities and Local Government] was justified in appointing commissioners to take over the executive functions of Rotherham Council'...not for any conventional malfeasance or misconduct, such as corruption, but for something unprecedented in the entire history of British local government...for its denial and abetting of child rape. (This 'first' for Labour was followed in 2019 by a second no less demeaning, when the party became the subject of an investigation by the Equality and Human Rights Commission in response to accusations of

‘institutional’ (specifically anti-Semitic) racism.) A similar scenario of denial and cover-up was played out in Manchester, as reported by the *Manchester Evening News* of January 29, 2020. In a story titled ‘Tensions simmer in Manchester town hall over who knew what about 2004 grooming paedophile gang’, it revealed that ‘alarmed [council] backbenchers have been asking questions internally of the city’s leadership about what was known of Operation Augusta itself and the abuse it has uncovered in 2004 and 2005.’ Operation Augusta was ‘the abandoned 2005 joint investigation into a massive [Muslim] south Manchester paedophile ring’ that had ‘revealed a series of shocking failures [sic] by police and social services.’

First, we had the Casey and Jay reports into Rotherham’s Muslim rape, quote, ‘industry’. But such was its scale, and the level of official collusion in its operations, that a third investigation was undertaken, this time by the Independent Office for Police [miss] Conduct. Released in June 2020, its findings were devastating. One of them was that girls aged 12 were deemed *by police* to have ‘consented’ to sex acts, even though, as I have said, sexual intercourse with a girl under the age of 13 carries a maximum sentence of life imprisonment. Another was a detective sergeant describing a victim of gang rape as ‘worldly wise, not meek and mild.’ Police failed to investigate an older man who was discovered naked in a room with one of the victims. There were even no proceedings taken when a rapist handed over a missing girl to police for more sexual abuse as part of a deal not to arrest him. (I see no reason whatsoever to doubt that this was a common practice...a police rape geld.) Police took no action after approaching a parked car and being told by a male occupant that he had just had a sex act performed on him by one of two girls in the car. A father of a girl who had been raped was told that she ‘might learn her lesson’, whatever that might be. No disciplinary action was taken against any of the officers who had colluded in the mass rape of children. They were simply given written warnings and ‘words of advice’. Yet these were police who had ‘turned a blind’ eye’ to what was going under their noses, an ‘industrial scale’ sexual abuse of at least 1,400 children by thousands of Muslim men, some in their fifties. Of the 35 men eventually convicted, despite the efforts of the police, of various offences connected with Rotherham’s rape industry, all but two had Muslim names, 94%, compared to the Muslim male share of Rotherham’s male population, of 4%. But I have it on good authority (that of the Tories, Corbyn and the *Guardian* to name three) that perpetrators of the crimes for which they were convicted are distributed pretty much evenly across the UK’s male population.

As in other locations where Muslim rape gangs were given free rein, responsible employees of Manchester’s Labour Council, although, like the police, fully aware of their operations, not only did nothing to protect their vulnerable victims, to whom many, if not most, it owed a legal duty of care, but actively assisted their abusers. In one case, the most notorious, the same report, commissioned by the city’s Labour Mayor, Andy Burnham, revealed that as far back as 2003, social workers knew a 15-year-old girl, Victoria Agoglia, was being sexually abused and forcibly injected with heroin, a standard practice of rape gangs to make the now-addicted victim submit to sexual slavery in return for more ‘fixes’. Yet, incredibly, Victoria’s rapists collected her, quote, ‘in plain sight’ of staff at the care (sic) home where she was staying. This was also a routine followed in other care homes, not just in Manchester but Rotherham and elsewhere, one which converted places of protection and care for vulnerable children into publicly-funded brothels providing rape fodder for the gratification of the animal appetites of depraved and sadistic, overwhelmingly

Muslim paedophiles. And surely, given the extent of care home and council complicity necessarily involved in this combined operation, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that some of the vast revenues it generated (just one child could earn £100,000 a year for her pimp) found its way into the bank balances of those public employees who furnished the facilities and provided the sex slaves essential for the trade's functioning. As an example of the degree of their complicity in this lucrative 'joint enterprise', the same report revealed, even more incredibly, that 'a man identified as her [i.e., Victoria's] pimp was given permission to visit her in her accommodation three times a week'. This is rape facilitation pure and simple, and what is more, under-age rape. Yet as in all other identical cases, not a single prosecution for misconduct in public office, either of police, social workers, or council officials. And if there had been, those so accused could, some might say with a modicum of justice, have pleaded they were simply adhering to a policy emanating from the very highest levels.

Victoria died of a heroin overdose, injected by Mohammed (there's a surprise) Yaqoob, who at his trial, was nevertheless acquitted of manslaughter and instead sentenced to three and a half years on drugs charges, out in less than two if he behaved himself. So much for 'institutional Islamophobia'. Labour councillor Sue Cooley, a leading social services officer at the time, and in charge of Operation Augusta, also wound up an investigation into the circumstances surrounding Victoria's death 'due to a lack of resources'. In her statement responding to the Burnham report, she said 'I wish that I had known more and been able to do more.' Yet she was the one who closed down two investigations, pleading lack of resources. Funding however was available to pay the salary of Pauline Newman, the Director of Child Services at the time of the cover-up of the Victoria Agoglia scandal, to the tune of £139,000 per annum, nearly double that of an MP, and only £3,500 less than the Prime Minister. And what she and her colleagues presided over may well have been even worse than just collusion in child rape. The *Manchester Evening News* of May 7, 2020, reported that 'a children's social care worker' had been arrested 'on suspicion of sexual activity with a child'. Once again, I have to ask...where were the protests of the feminists and the metooers? Because surely here we see exposed patriarchy at its most vile and predatory. I suspect that their silence was due to its having the wrong skin colour and religion.

Let us now look another location where again, for decades, the same public agencies looked the other way, and therefore effectively, if in not necessarily in every case illegally, colluded with a town's Muslim rape industry...Telford's in the West Midlands. The industry is known to have been in business no later than 1975, that is for more than forty years and, thanks to the supportive attitude of the police and other public officials, had reached a scale which, according to the Home Office, by 2015, was the highest of any town or city in the UK. No mean achievement, in view of the stiff competition and considering that of Telford's population of 170,000, no more than a thousand at most were Muslim males of rape committing age. As in Rotherham and Manchester, and of course elsewhere, nearly all their victims, some 1,000, were white and, we can be sure, mainly from working class and broken homes. And also as in other locations, although Telford police were fully aware by no later than the early 1980s that children were being groomed, pimped and raped by Muslim men, they ignored it. It took another 20 years before seven men were charged and convicted of a range of sexual crimes. Each, *pace* Corbyn, had Muslim names, with three called Mohammed. Their ages ranged from

25 to 61. I repeat, just seven Muslims were convicted, out of a total of thousands of rapists, who over more than three decades, abused at least 1,000 victims, all of them children, receiving sentences amounting to no more than 54 and half years, with four only serving two and half years. In total, an average sentence of less than eight years, with every prospect of remission after serving only half the full term. The girls they abused however will have been marked for life. Not surprisingly, in view of its scale, the convictions had little or no impact on the town's rape industry, because it continued to thrive into the next decade and beyond, as was revealed by a *Sunday Mirror* investigation in 2018. As elsewhere, fear of accusations of racism was the excuse given for a lack of action against the rape gangs. West Mercia Police Chief Tom Harding, 'significantly disputed' the scale of the problem revealed by the *Mirror*. 'I don't believe Telford has a discernible [sic] problem compared to other towns' he told the *Shropshire Star*. 'Child exploitation will be taking place all over the country. [Correct, and for the same reasons as in Telford], and Telford is no different to anywhere else.' (Not so. Despite the strong competition, it was ranked worst in the UK.)

Just like Corbyn, a Tory government report on the subject, and the *Guardian*, Harding denied there was any ethnic (and therefore religious) dimension to grooming and gang rape. 'Sexual offending across Telford and Wrekin is virtually identically proportionate to the breakdown of society.' Another lie. Muslim males comprised 1.7% of all Telford males. So, it follows that if what Harding (and we must not forget Corbyn, the *Guardian* and the Tories) said is correct, we would expect nearly all those convicted of pimping, trafficking grooming and gang rape of children in Telford, with a population that is 98% non-Muslim, to be...non-Muslims. Adding to the seven Muslims convicted in 2013 the three Telford men with Muslim names convicted of sexual offences against children in 2019 (one for rape, two named Mohammed and averaging a six-year sentence) we have in all ten Muslim men and no infidels convicted of these offences...100%, not 1.7%. Hardly Harding's (and Corbyn's) 'proportionate', one might say.

A report on Telford's Muslim rape industry, issued in July 2022, as summarised by ITV, said the following: 'Key agencies [for which read, as in Rotherham, Manchester and elsewhere, the police, social services, schools and the justice system] dismissed [sexual] exploitation as "child prostitution" [no less illegal than child rape], and child exploitation [ditto] was ignored.' 'Up to 1,000 girls, as young as 11, were gang-raped, trafficked, held at gun point [!!!], beaten and sold for sex.' 'Victims say they sought help from authorities but were left frightened after being told police could not [i.e., would not] help them. Some girls said they were raped by hundreds of men.' As always, we are told nothing as to the religious identity of these hundreds of rapists, but as we have seen, the names of those convicted are a helpful guide. As a footnote to the Telford story, it should be pointed out that on at least four occasions while he was Labour Leader, Corbyn posted comments on matters pertaining to Telford, three of them describing his activities in the town. But not one even alluded to the orgy of sexual crimes being committed under his nose, which had by this time become public knowledge.

The same sordid story revealed itself in Oldham, another former mill town, with 18% of its population classified as Muslims. After decades of sexual abuse and exploitation of children by the town's Muslim rape industry, a report on its activities, and those that facilitated them, was released in July 2022. One specific case cited dating back to 2005 was that of 12-year-old Sophie (not her real name)

who was repeatedly raped 'for hours' after she had been turned away by police for being 'drunk'. The police were given the names of two of her rapists, but they refused to charge them. One of the two was later jailed for the attempted murder of his wife, but not for the rape of a 12-year white girl. When she reported her ordeal to Oldham Council child care staff, they accused her of being 'prone to fantasies' and having chosen to 'put herself at risk.' Yet again, we see the same pattern: police collusion with social services to protect the rapists, and the same response to their victims, that, to quote the Home Office circular, 'being raped was an 'informed choice''. The fact that the scale and level of collusion, corruption and depravity of the child rape industry revealed in Manchester, Telford, Oldham and Rotherham were not unique to those four locations, combined with evidence that the Home Office under Labour authorised it, and under the Tories, suppressed the religious identity of its main perpetrators (a coyness shared by the *Manchester Evening News* description of the rapists as 'Asians') leads to but one conclusion.

Having eliminated local 'failings', the root causes boil down to three: firstly, a central government policy of the appeasement of Islam, decanted down to local various local authorities and agencies, that led to the sacrificing of under-privileged, non-voting young non-Muslim girls to organised Muslim rape gangs and rapists of voting age; secondly, a working climate of 'political correctness' and thus genuine fear of accusations of racism and, third, on the part of the rape gangs, the teachings of Islam on the Allah-created inferiority of Muslim women, and crucially, the even greater inferiority of non-Muslim women, in relation to Muslim men. This teaching, inscribed both in the *Koran* and in numerous *Hadith*, is sufficient, in the minds of its perpetrators, to justify and motivate, but not, on its own, to make possible the kinds of barbarities inflicted on non-Muslim girls not just in Rotherham, Telford, Oxford, Aylesbury and Sheffield, but wherever Muslim men have access to non-Muslim women, as in the ISIS occupied territories of the Middle East, or those controlled by Boko Haram in Nigeria. In order for the wish to become a reality, *those in power have to allow it*. Hence the necessary relationship between causes one and three. Where those in power are themselves the rapists, as with the Jihadis of ISIS and Boko Haram, everything goes according to plan. But before Muslim men can have their Sharia way with *kuffar* women in non-Islamic countries, there has to be a special kind of facilitating factor in play that in its absence, would in any civilised country result in their conviction, receiving lengthy jail sentences and in the UK, entry onto the sex offenders register. And the reality is that in the UK, instead of such judicial actions, the green light for Muslim gang rape had indeed been provided by its public authorities and politicians, with results in no way different from those in the Islamic State and north eastern Nigeria. It is those at the very summits of society, irrespective of political party, and beginning in the 1970s, who devised, initiated or approved the intensive indoctrination of public servants in 'cultural sensitivity' and 'community awareness', and authorised intensive compulsory courses of 'diversity training', all under the banner of multi-culturalism, who are responsible for generating the political, cultural, ideological and moral climate that allowed these crimes to go unpunished for decades and, in doing so, blighting the lives of their victims.

The tragic results of this politically-correct brain-washing, what Mao Tse-tung called 'thought reform', go some way to explaining how the Nazis were able, in the space of a few years, to inculcate and then exploit a similar indifference by millions of Germans to the fate of the Jews. However, there is a difference in the

two situations. Those few Germans who spoke out against (as distinct from declining to take part in) the extermination of the Jews knowingly risked losing their liberty and most likely, their lives in doing so. The worst that whistle-blowers could expect in Rotherham, or the other towns and cities where Muslims rape gangs freely operated, was the loss of a job, social ostracism and accusations of racism. But, incredibly and shamefully, as the years rolled by and the rapes continued on an ever-expanding scale, there was silence and even collusion. And in situations where those who have the power to prevent a wrong do nothing, their silence conveys assent.

(*Inter alia*, I cannot at this point resist recalling an episode from my own career in academe, dating back to the mid-1980s, when the onslaught on Enlightenment values was already gathering its current vast momentum. I had been obliged, along with all my lecturer colleagues, to attend a day-long seminar of totalitarian mind bending on the need for 'racial awareness' in education, a state of mind, one would have thought, more fitting for those attending a Nuremburg rally, a Ku Klux Klan convention or a pro-Apartheid demonstration in South Africa. (as we shall see, it was Hitler who was almost certainly the first to use this very same phrase.) Utterly bored and not a little disgusted with the proceedings, I idly leafed through the booklet that accompanied the event, only to discover, much to my amusement, that I, along with every other white person in the room except the (white) instructor, was a hardened and probably incurable racist, the reason being that the number and varieties of racism listed were so all-encompassing they covered almost every possible thought anyone could have on the subject. Which was of course, and was intended to be, grist to the mill of the then burgeoning 'anti-racist' industry. The version which I, without knowing it, was practising in my academic career was described, perfectly accurately, as the 'colour blind' approach in which the educator does their level best to pay no heed to the skin colour (or the gender for that matter) of who is being taught, and instead focuses on stimulating and imparting knowledge to their colourless minds. (Many years later, I had confirmation of my guilt in an article by a Dr Monnica Williams for *Psychology Today*, which argued that, contrary to what the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King once advocated, 'treating people as individuals as equally as possible, without regard to race, culture or ethnicity' was 'a form of racism'.)

As this publicly funded lunacy (for such it surely was) ground uselessly on, a colleague sitting near me, sensing that my detachment was evidence of my disapproval of the proceedings, turned to me and in a low voice said, 'all this makes me realise how right George Orwell was'. Need one say more? Were he with us today Orwell would have also had confirmed his worst fears about the future of western civilisation by the adoption of newspeak at one of the UK's top educational institutions, the academic madhouse that goes by the name of Goldsmiths College, which had advertised one of its courses for teachers as being for the purpose of raising 'racial awareness'. In April of the year 2015, an event convened by the College's students union to promote what it called 'diversity' did so by banning from attendance all male and non-black women students. The college 'Diversity [sic] Officer', a certain Bahar Mustafa, who had tweeted the Third Wave feminist war cry, 'kill all men', and who in appearance at least was certainly not 'black', announced in flawless wakespeak that 'this meeting is for all self-defining [sic] BLACK and ETHNIC MINORITY women and non-binary [sic] people with gender identities that include "women".' (note the emphases, and the quotation marks

around 'women'.) If 'self-defining' is taken to mean what it means, it would seem that skin colour, like gender, is not in the genes, but in the mind, or as post-modernism would have it, is a 'social construct' that can presumably be modified at will, as in the case of Bahar Mustafa, to suit the occasion. It should give us pause for thought that not only lunacies such as this can be indulged at public expense, but that those who promote and take part in them will hold positions of influence and even authority in British society in the not-too-distant future.)

Returning to the main theme, there is another question that has to be asked, and answered, however much the Islamophiles may dislike what that answer is. Where and how have so many Muslim men (and the combined number of rapists and pimps, we have been informed, runs into the thousands) learned to treat girls and women habitually in ways that not only place them beyond the moral boundaries of modern civilisation, but of the human race? Although the vast majority of these biologically quite normal but culturally sub-human sub-savages were born and raised in the UK, they were being described in such cases as of 'Pakistani heritage', as if that was the explanation for their behaviour rather than their religion, ignoring the fact that some of the convicted perpetrators had been Muslims from three continents: Albania, Kuwait, Morocco, Sudan, Bangladesh, Somalia, Turkey, Kurdistan, Palestine, Iraq, Iran and Syria. The number of Christian 'Asians' in Pakistan is currently 2.5 million, and of Hindus 3 million. Are they to be tarred with the same racist brush? But of course, even now, when 'political correctness' has at last been blamed for the decades of public authorities' refusal to confront and deal with the issue, it still continues, because nothing is said of the root cause of their behaviour, which is neither one of race or nation, but the great unmentionable, *religion*.

We continue. Not only in Rotherham but in nearby Sheffield, a rape and pimping gang of at least 320 men also operated with impunity, abusing at least 200 young girls. According to an ex-police officer, parents of the victims were silenced by death threats and the victims themselves by holding kettles of boiling water over them. One girl *had her tongue nailed to a table* to deter her from informing on her on her pimps and rapists, and another girl aged 12, had her foetus aborted by a *claw hammer rammed into her vagina*. When the same police officer volunteered to create a special unit to combat the rape gangs, he was told by a senior officer, 'it's not going to happen. Return to your districts.' This instruction was official, if not publicised, Home Office policy. A member of the Oxford rape gang branded a girl on the buttocks with the first letter of his name which just happened to be Mohammed. All this and more happened in England, not the Islamic State or Taliban Afghanistan. Whatever else may be said about the shortcomings of the police, by refusing to take any action against these barbarians, at least they ensured they could not be accused of Islamophobia.

This was nowhere truer than in Hull, where its police fought a last-ditch, rearguard battle against the tide of Muslim rape prosecutions sweeping through the rest of Yorkshire. Towards the end of November 2021, Sky News revealed that the city's police had wound up an investigation into organised sexual abuse of young girls, claiming that there was insufficient evidence to warrant further action. Sky News had seen some of this evidence, which included texted threats to burn alive a young girl if she refused to be raped regularly by a gang of men. A girl described being tied to a radiator while wearing her school uniform and being raped by a man in his sixties, while another girl was raped by eight men while unconscious. The

girls described their rapists as of Asian and Middle Eastern appearance...in other words, Muslims.

Despite victims reporting the names of their rapists to the police, some 30 in all, after being interviewed, no action was taken against them. In the words of Hull's Detective Chief Superintendent Philip Ward, 'Critically, the investigation found no evidence of organised child sexual exploitation in any part of our community, either geographically or through ethnicity'... just like Telford, and just as Corbyn, the Tories, and the *Guardian* had said. Hear no Muslim rape, see no Muslim rape, believe no Muslim rape, so investigate and prosecute no Muslim rape. After a girl named her abusers to the police, she immediately received death threats from those she had named, *the police having tipped them off*. All this and much more had been verified by Sky News. At the same time, the BBC reported that Rotherham's rape industry, despite a number of convictions, was still in business, while across south Yorkshire, four police authorities were still stubbornly refusing to change their multi-cultural ways, failing, as was now required, to identify child sex traffickers and rapists by their ethnicity. (Which explained nothing, but not their religion, which in the vast majority of cases, accounted for a great deal.)

In Rotherham, and other town and cities not only throughout the UK, but Scandinavia, decades of multi-culturalism and political correctness had combined with Islamic teachings on the inferiority of women to create an open season for the treatment of young non-Muslim girls as prostitutes and rape fodder or, as the *Koran* has it, 'booty'. The *Koran* is quite explicit concerning the permissibility of what amounts to the possession and rape of non-Islamic women, and no amount of 'contextualisation' can make it say and mean other than what it says and means: 'And all married women are forbidden unto you save those captives whom your right hand possesses'. (Chapter 4, Verse 24) The meaning here is obvious. Other Muslims' wives, being the property of their husbands, you cannot touch. But infidel 'captive' women, including wives, are fair game. It is easy to see how this Koranic teaching came to be applied in a necessarily modified form in the UK, as in other countries of the Muslim diaspora. In theory, at least, no raping of Muslim women or other Muslim men's wives (raping one's own is of course entirely another matter) but also, in infidel lands, because of the risks involved, not as a rule of non-Muslim wives either. By a process of elimination, that left infidel single girls, the younger and the more vulnerable the better. Let the exponents of 'contextualisation' explain away the 'surface' meaning of this Koranic verse sanctifying the treatment of such 'slave girls' as nothing but sexual 'booty: 'Prophet, we have made it lawful to you the wives you have granted dowries *and the slave girls whom God has given you as booty*'. (Chapter 33, Verse 50, emphasis added) And the prophet, being perfect, is to be emulated in all things by devout Muslims, as we have seen in Rochdale, Rotherham, Keighley, Halifax, Aylesbury, Oxford, Telford and Sheffield and a score or more of other towns and cities across the UK. As a series of spectacular trials has proven beyond all doubt, over at least the last four decades, tens, probably hundreds of thousands of *kuffar* girls have been in effect taken 'captive' and treated as 'booty' by Muslim (not 'Asian') rape gangs and reduced to a state of abject sexual servitude. And whatever the Islamophiles might say, the *Koran* permits it. Anthropologists will tell us that most, if not all traditional, essentially tribal-based cultures practised the kidnapping and rape of the women of enemy tribes. And this indeed is the case.

As recently as the 1990s, for all the denials of Corbyn, Serbian militiamen murdered the husbands of thousands of (and here is the irony, mainly Muslim) Bosnian women, who were then gang raped as the (in this case Eastern Orthodox) spoils of war. This ancient but still surviving custom of treating women prisoners as sex slaves is indeed sanctified not only by the *Koran*, but the Old Testament of the Bible, from which much of the *Koran* has been clumsily cribbed. In fact, the Bible not only justifies these practices, but commands them. Deuteronomy Chapter 20 is here quite explicit: '...thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword. But the women and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil [sic] thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself.' (Verses 13 and 14) Chapter 21 goes into more detail:

[T]he Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands and though hast taken them captive. And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire for her to be thy wife; then thou shall bring her home to thine house...and she shall remain in thine house and bewail her father and mother a full month: and after that thou shall go in unto her [sic!], and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife. (Verses 10-11)

Irrespective of what Obama might say to the contrary, for we can easily imagine him claiming, in response to accusations of Islamic abuse of females, that 'no religion condones the rape of women', this is Biblically-sanctioned Boko Haram or ISIS-style abduction and rape, pure and simple. However, whatever their holy book might tell them to do, Jews don't do it now and have not been in a position to do so since the Roman conquest of Palestine in 63 BC, though Christians in the Balkans have as recently as the 1990s. Muslims, whether it is Boko Haram, ISIS, or the rape gangs of Rotherham and forty or more cities and towns across the UK, have done so well into the 21st century. Those in authority, including police, social workers, school teachers, and politicians, both Muslim and infidel, have found this abuse by Muslim men of young non-Muslim girls, organised in many cases 'on an industrial scale' (1,400 girls in Rotherham alone) and capable of generating an annual income for pimping just one girl of £100,000 and more, quite acceptable. And not only acceptable, but we can be sure, for some, financially and even sexually rewarding, as proved be the case in Rotherham. And when, after decades of denial, it was finally exposed, it was invariably blamed on 'Asians', a racist slur if ever there was one.

Taking 'Asian' to mean the peoples of the Indian sub-continent, and not those of the rest of Asia such the 'Orientals' of China, Korea, Japan, the Malayan Peninsula and Indo-China, out of a total of 1.8 billion 'Asians', just over a quarter, 480 million, are Muslims, while under a third of the world's Muslims, totalling in 2017 1.5 billion, are 'Asians'. Even more to the point, no evidence has been produced that diaspora 'Asian' Hindus, Sikhs, Jainists, Christians and Buddhists have been involved in the same business of gang rape and pimping. While the names of those who were convicted leave no doubt whatsoever as to their religious identity, the nearest the Jay report came to identifying the Rotherham rape gangs was to describe them as men of 'Pakistani heritage'. This explains and defines nothing, as not all Pakistanis are Muslims, while all the convicted rapists were and what is more, proud to be so, on hearing their sentence, crying out, *Allahu Akbar*, God is Great. One of their number demonstrated his devoutness when, according to evidence given to police and then ignored, he 'raped with a broken bottle' one of his victims, and

ordered a girl he had been raping to 'kiss the perpetrator's feet at gun point'.

As per Home Office instruction, the police allowed their local race industry all the latitude it needed. One rape victim was offered the following advice by an officer of the law: 'Don't worry - you aren't the first to be raped by XX and you won't be the last.' The *Oxford Mail* reported how gang rapists...all Muslims... had 'scratched, choked, beaten, gang raped, burnt' their victims and sexually assaulted with '*knives and a baseball bat*'. One described how she had 'turned up at the police station at 2 or 3 AM, blood all over me, soaked through my trousers to the crotch. They dismissed me as being naughty, a nuisance. I was bruised and bloody.' This was the reaction to child rape by an English police officer, not of a tribal elder in the Pakistan or Afghan outback, and in a UK where the same officer had the power to arrest anyone who dared to publicly speak the truth about the religion that made these crimes possible. (Yes...this happens. See Chapter 28) Of one thing we can be absolutely sure. Had the roles been reversed, with 'infidel' rape gangs pimping young Muslim girls, as the SWP alleged, it would not have taken thirty years before the perpetrators were apprehended, charged, tried, and convicted.

Why do Muslim rapists mainly use white English girls for their pleasures? For the Muslim male, young Muslim girls, being the property of their male relatives and destined, unless they are raped by an older male relative, to stay virgins until marriage are, officially at least, off limits. That is why it is generally accepted as being open season so far as non-Muslim girls are concerned. No such latitude however is allowed to Muslim females, again as recent tragic cases have demonstrated. Marriage, or any kind of romantic relationship with a *kuffar*, is *haram*. Muslim girls are chattels, to be FGM'd, and then married or even sold off within the clan, sometimes to a much older relative who seeks a new, younger additional wife and is ready to pay the going rate. So, should a young Muslim female choose to ungratefully reject the marital future mapped out for her by her family and, worse again, be suspected of forming a genuine romantic attachment to an infidel young male, or to a Muslim of the wrong clan or version of Islam, exemplary retribution is called for, usually carried out by the girl's family. By possibly first raping, and then murdering the errant daughter, the violated honour of the family, in the first place its males, can be restored in the eyes of the clan and the 'close knit, vibrant community'.

There is ample evidence that, as in the cases of organised Muslim gang rape and pimping, the customary blind eye has been turned by public authorities towards Islamic 'honour killings'. Whether this is due to a politically correct desire to preserve at all costs harmonious 'community relations', or is motivated by a racist and sexist indifference to the plight of young Muslim females is hard to tell, since both lead to the same result...'none of our business'. What we do know of what is officially called 'honour violence' is believed to be but a glimpse of a much larger and still growing aspect of a young woman's lot in the diaspora Islamic 'community'. The scale of this species of Islamic male violence on women can be appreciated by the fact that in 2011 alone, the number of 'honour violence' incidents recorded by 37 of the UK's 52 police forces was 2,823. And since then, the number has continued to rise. *Hadith*-sanctioned female genital mutilation (inflicted on as many as 130,000 Muslim girls in the UK with, thus far, only one successful prosecution), *Koran*-sanctioned wife-beating, 'honour killing' and *Koran*-sanctioned marital rape and forced and child marriage constitute a pattern of life, and of death, for Muslim women that we in the West have knowingly allowed to

take root and flourish almost unchecked and, what is worse, in the name of 'tolerance', 'cultural sensitivity' and 'community cohesion'. And those who should be protesting the loudest, the feminists, are silent. Because there is the glass ceiling and the white patriarchy.

I say 'the West', because the UK is far from being the only country where infidel girls and women have been the preferred victims of rape by Muslim men, only in most cases, they are not of the 'Pakistani heritage' that the Jay report, studiously eschewing a religious cause, wrongly implied explained their behaviour in Rotherham. Sweden, before the onset of mass Muslim immigration, was among the safest, if not the safest, country for women anywhere in the world. Then, with a surge in Muslim migration, it was on the way to becoming one vast Rotherham. Back in 1975, the year in which Sweden, with the very best of intentions, decided to become an official 'multicultural society', the number of recorded rapes was 421. By 2014, it had soared to 6,620, an increase of 1472%. As a result, Sweden had a rape rate of 53.2 rapes per 100,000 of the population, *second in the world only to Lesotho*, at 91.6. Inevitably, all manner of spurious explanations were forthcoming to divert attention from the principal cause of this unprecedented surge in rapes, the main one proffered being that more women were now prepared to report it. This of course could account for part of the increase, but only a small fraction, for we are looking at here is a 14-fold increase. One young man interviewed by the Swedish Daily *DN* summed up the attitude of his fellow male Muslims towards rape. He is describing his feelings about Swedish women, but it could just as easily be working class white girls in Rochdale, Halifax, Keighley, Rotherham, Oxford, Sheffield or Aylesbury:

It's not as wrong to rape a Swedish girl as an Arab girl. The Swedish girl gets a lot of help afterwards, and she's probably been fucked already. But the Arab girl will get problems with her family. For her it is a great shame to be raped. It is important that she retains her virginity when she marries...I do not have much [sic] respect for Swedish girls. You could say they get fucked till they are broken.

Swedish women were to be treated by Muslim men as rape fodder...barely human, one degree down from Muslim girls, who were valuable as chattels. In seeking an explanation for the soaring rape rate, the one factor studiously ignored by most Swedish commentators was that the increase in reported rapes coincided exactly with the parallel surge in Muslim immigration, one that was partly responsible for a 2 million increase in Sweden's population from 1975 to 2020. Of Sweden's total population of 10.2 million, today around 800,000 are Muslims, 8%. This percentage is set to increase, as it is in many other European countries, and not only through continued immigration. While the net reproduction rate of native Swedes is below 1, with Muslims, it is well above 1. Multiculturalists, confronted with this unprecedented increase in rape might, as a last resort, want to believe that native Swedish men, from being the world's most respectful of a woman's right to say no, have suddenly turned into the world's second worst sexual predators. They might want to, but no-one else is going to believe it. Though hard to come by, Sweden's rape statistics show that a rapist is ten times more likely to be of foreign extraction than a native Swede, even though native Swedes comprise around 90% of the total population. At least 70% of rapes in Sweden are perpetrated by males belonging to the 8% of the population who are Muslims; a ratio that indicates that

when it comes to rape, as with other crimes, Muslim males were performing what is known technically as 'heavy lifting'. (See Appendix C) The same trends in rape statistics, accompanied and for sure caused by similar patterns of Muslim immigration, have also been recorded in Denmark and Norway and more recently, thanks to *dhimmi* Chancellor Merkel, Germany. Again, it must be stressed, we are looking at the impact of a culture and a religion, not the behaviour of a race or races. While UK Muslim rape gangs are described as usually 'of Pakistani heritage', Sweden's Muslim rapists originate from a totally different ethnic background, being either from Africa (mainly Somalia) Afghanistan or the Middle East. So what they each have in common is not 'ethnicity' or a place of origin, but a misogynistic religion that sanctions the rape of non-Muslim females. In its dealings with Muslim immigrants, Sweden has had a rougher ride than most European countries, mainly because of its world-renowned tradition of toleration, pluralism and openness, principles that Muslims despise in their own countries but are only too ready to exploit in everybody else's. (See Appendix C)

Though reluctant at best to confront Muslim anti-social and criminal behaviour at home, especially rape, in Sweden's external relations with the Muslim world, everything has its limits, as the Saudi Kingdom discovered. The Swedish government, a left-wing coalition, marked International Women's Day of March 8, 2015, by sending its Foreign Minister, the Social Democrat Margot Wallstrom, to a session of the Arab League convened in Cairo. The speech she was due to make on March 9 was never given because, briefed as to its contents, the newly-crowned and western boot-licked King Salman pulled rank and denied her the right to speak. The usual Muslim 'offence' had been taken to the following passage in her censored address: '

Human rights are a priority in Swedish foreign policy. Freedom of association, assembly, religion and expression are not only fundamental rights and important tools in the creation of vibrant societies. They are indispensable in the fight against extremism and radicalisation. So is a vibrant civil society.

King Salman rightly saw this a barely veiled (no pun intended) attack on his own misogynistic feudal despotism, and also as being totally at odds with the definition of Islamic 'human rights' adopted at the OIC summit in Cairo in 1990. Obviously at his instigation, the Arab League issued a justification of its silencing of the Swedish Minister. Her statement was 'irresponsible' [but to whom?] and unacceptable' (but not it, seems, untrue). Obviously and intentionally, Wallstrom had struck a raw nerve; because the statement went on to specifically rebut her implied criticism of the Saudi regime. The kingdom was 'based on the Sharia' (true), 'defended the rights of the people' (which famously did not include the right of a woman to drive a car) and 'safeguarded their blood [frequently shed at public beheadings and floggings], wealth [concentrated in the Swiss bank accounts of the Saudi Royal family] and honour [as in honour killings]'. On March 10, the Swedish government unilaterally terminated its contract to supply arms to Saudi Arabia. The next day, the Saudi Kingdom recalled its ambassador. Petro-Islamic blackmail works, but so does calling its bluff.

Addendum: Spoils of War

As we have seen, both Corbyn and the long-awaited (and much redacted) Tory government report on the subject insisted there was no particular religious or ethnic dimension to organised sex crime involving the trafficking and rape of under-age girls. They would have liked to persuade an increasingly sceptical public, without offering any statistical evidence to substantiate it, that its perpetrators were distributed pretty much evenly across all ‘communities’, be they religious or ethnic. Let us look then at some typical high-profile cases predating and following the report, and see how that claim stands up to the evidence.

In 2016, 18 men from Halifax and Bradford were found guilty of raping under-age girls and other sexual offences. All but one had Muslim names. In February 2019, as part of the same investigation, nine more men from the same locations were found guilty of rape and other offences involving children. Once again, all but one had Muslim names. In December 2019, also as part of the same investigation, another 16 men from Halifax were charged with child rape and trafficking, that is, pimping, under-age girls, one of those so charged at the time of the offences being a serving police officer. And yet again, all but one had Muslim names. Police believed that as many as a hundred men from the same areas could have been involved in the same crimes. The two most recent cases involved charges of the rape of a 13-year-old girl brought against 29, repeat, 29 men, again, all from Yorkshire, this time, *every one with a Muslim name.*, and, again in Yorkshire, where at Leeds magistrates court on November 29, 2021, 39 men were charged with the rape of six young girls over a period of twenty years. Here too, *all 39 had Muslims names*, 13, one third, being Mohammed. I will not include a sixth case, that of 16 men, aged between 33 and 60, once again hailing from Labour MP Naz Shah’s patch, Bradford, who were arrested in December 2021 on charges of sexual offences relating to one female in the period between 2002 and 2009, the reason being that their names were not published. Nevertheless, I am confident that if they are charged with the said offences, their names will once again give the lie to Corbyn’s claim that organised sex trafficking and gang rape are spread evenly across ‘all communities’.

In these five cases, of the 111 men charged with or convicted of sexual offences with a child, *only three did not have Muslim names.*...and even one or more of these three could have been converts, as has proved to be the case in other trials. I can assure the reader that had I chosen at random a dozen or more other similar trials and cases, the result would have been the same, or so nearly so as to make no difference. The evidence is overwhelming, the conclusion irrefutable...that is, for those who go by the court records, and not politically correct wishful thinking. Organised, or to quote the Jay Report, ‘industrial scale’ child rape and pimping is *exclusively* a Muslim business. Yet, there are those who, like Corbyn and the Tories, would like to convince the public otherwise. Saba Kaiser, with the job description of ‘ethnic minority ambassador to the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse’, claimed that child sexual abuse ‘doesn’t have a religion, it doesn’t have a culture’. When it comes to ‘industrial scale’ child rape, which is what she was specifically referring to, it most certainly does. And that ‘culture’ is an Islamic one, as the statistics cited above and below prove. Writing in the *Guardian* (again I ask, ‘where else?’) Ella Cockbain and Waqas Tufail said that ‘the two-year study of the Home Office makes very [sic] clear there are no [sic] grounds for asserting that

Muslim or Pakistani heritage men are disproportionately engaged in such crimes...’ ‘No evidence’? The Casey and Jay reports say the exact opposite, as do the court records of those convicted of ‘such crimes’. Let us ‘do the math’.

Muslim men comprise approximately 4% of all men in the UK. In the five typical cases I have cited, Muslim men comprised 97% of those either charged with or convicted for the sexual offences specified above. Muslim men are therefore over-represented in the cases cited by a factor of 22. Non-Muslim men, who comprise 96% of the UK male population, account for the remaining 3% of such cases, *underrepresented* by a factor of 33. Give that these statistics are representative of all such cases...and again, I can assure the reader that they are - we arrive at the following conclusion, one that differs more than somewhat from the lies told by Saba Kaiser, Corbyn, the Socialist Workers Party, the *Guardian* and the Tories concerning the incidence of Muslim gang rape: a Muslim man is approximately 700 times more likely to be charged with the grooming, trafficking and gang raping of children than a non-Muslim man.

Next, I wish to place here on record the details, in so far as they have entered the public domain, of two tragic cases intimately connected with Muslim sexual abuse of white girls, the first being the murder of Charlene Downes. When aged 14, she disappeared in her home town of Blackpool on November 1, 2003. Last seen near a number of fast-food outlets, a police investigation concluded that she had been murdered within hours of her last sighting. In the course of the investigation, it came to light that Charlene was one of around 60 white, mainly working-class girls in Blackpool who were being groomed and pimped for sex by and for men known to be Muslims. After a lengthy investigation, two Muslim men stood trial in May 2017 for her murder; namely, Iyad Albattikhi, the owner of a fast-food outlet, and his business partner, Mohammed Reveshi who, together with Albattikhi, was accused of disposing of her body by dismembering it and serving up her flesh as kebab. Reveshi was also accused of having illegal underage sex with Charlene.

After the jury failed to reach a verdict, it was revealed that one of the jury members knew one of the two men on trial. Other members of the jury had been subjected to intimidation. There was also the possibility that some thought the details of the case too horrific to be true. A second trial was cancelled on the grounds of errors allegedly committed in the course of the investigation, and the two accused were released and awarded £250,000 each for wrongful arrest. The police officer found guilty of misconduct in the course of the investigation was asked to resign, but on appeal, the Police Arbitration Tribunal overturned the ruling. She in turn sued the police authority for £500,000 for defamation. The case remains unsolved, with a police reward of £100,000 for information leading to the conviction of Charlene’s killer or killers.

(It was a series of demonstrations in Blackpool by the English Defence League that finally publicly exposed the religious issues surrounding the murder of Charlene Downes, issues that had hitherto been either ignored, or obfuscated by racial references to Pakistanis and ‘Asians’. The thanks the EDL got for doing so was to be accused of racism, even though the EDL had a multi-racial membership and was only opposed, like millions of UK citizens of all races and political dispositions, to the negative influence of Islam on British society, not to individual Muslims, whatever their race. This was just one of many instances where race and religion were quite deliberately conflated to brand criticism of Islam as racist.)

The second tragedy was the ‘honour killing’ of Laura Wilson, murdered in Rotherham when aged 17 by a Muslim man described as her ‘boyfriend’, Ashtiaq Asghar, in October 2010. Laura had a four-month-old daughter by a friend of Asghar so, driven by jealousy, Asghar lured her to the side of a canal and after wounding her with a knife, threw her in the water and left her to drown. Sentencing Asghar at his trial for murder, the presiding judge said Asghar treated white girls as ‘sexual targets’ and not as human beings. He was not born with that racist attitude. Need one ask where he learned it from? It was subsequently revealed that like so many white working-class girls with Muslim ‘boy friends’, for which read pimps, Laura had been in the care, for what it was worth, of no fewer than 15 different Rotherham Social Services departments who, a report said, missed ‘numerous’ opportunities to protect her. Social services managers disagreed, claiming her death could not have been prevented.

So what were the staff of these 15 social service departments doing, apart from drawing their in many cases, grossly inflated salaries? Instead of admitting responsibility for the death of a vulnerable girl in their care, and ensuring that nothing like it happened again, Rotherham social services mounted a rearguard operation to clear their names. Already that same year, one private report on the sexual abuse of girls in Rotherham, more concerned with combatting a spurious white racism than protecting children in their care from all too real ‘Asian’ racist predators, claimed that ‘although the alleged [sic!] perpetrators are of Asian origin [as always, not Muslim] and the victims are white, this is the factuality [sic] of these cases alone, nothing more can be [i.e., should be] drawn from that. It is imperative [sic] that suggestions/allusions of a wider cultural phenomenon are avoided. These assertions are without foundation.’ (As we have seen, of the Yorkshire cases listed above, 97% involved Muslims)

In 2011, in the wake of the scandal surrounding Laura’s murder, the authors of a report produced by Rotherham’s Safeguarding Children Board (sic) were still insisting, firstly, that ‘children are generally [sic] safe within the [Rotherham] community’ (Rotherham child rape victims were already over 1,000 and counting), and secondly, that in so far as the organised sexual exploitation of children existed in society in general, it was ‘crucial to recognize that just as the ethnic identity of the perpetrators differs across the UK, so does that of the children.’ The first claim is true, in so far as some of them were not ‘Asians’ or Pakistanis but Arabs and Africans. But they were nearly all Muslims. So once again, and we can be sure deliberately, the focus was shifted away from religion to race. The second claim was a lie, as proved to be so in Rotherham, where all the victims were white. Obviously concerned to paint a picture of sexual trafficking and grooming that was remote from the real situation that obtained in Rotherham, the Report continued: ‘It is important that we do not allow [sic] a stereotype to develop, i.e., it is not just Asian men who commit this crime, nor are the victims only white.’ Yet it was precisely in Rotherham that the perpetrators were all ‘Asian’, to be precise, Pakistanis - and the victims all white, facts the authors of the report must surely have been aware of. That is why they said they had taken ‘great care’ to ‘ensure that its findings embrace Rotherham’s qualities of diversity’...in other words, these ‘findings’ were not ‘findings’ at all, but rather pre-determined politically correct fictions invented to produce a report that concealed the specifically religious nature of Rotherham’s child rape industry which, far from being ‘diverse’, was an exclusively Muslim concern, just as its victims were exclusively white. (Here again

we have Corbyn's take on the Irving Berlin song 'everybody's doing it'.) Not by accident or oversight, the words 'Muslim' and 'Islam' do not occur once in the entire 145-page (much redacted) Report, yet the UK's rape industry would not exist but for the impact on Muslim men of the teachings of Islam on the status of non-Muslim woman and the role model of Mohammed in matters sexual, whom Islamic sources say raped the captive wives of non-Muslim men as his 'spoils of war', and consummated his marriage with his last wife when she was nine years old. Seeing that the *Koran* sanctions marital rape - 'your wives are a sort of tilth for you, so approach your tilth as and when you like.' (Chapter 22, Verse 223) - and Sharia law sets no age limit on sexual intercourse with young girls, raping *kuffar* English children is no big deal. What more proof do we need that the UK's gang rape industry was born of a culturally inherited misogynist theology, not biologically inherited 'Asian' genes?

Only with the publication of an investigation in 2011 by the *Times* journalist Andrew Norfolk did Muslim grooming, trafficking and gang rape of English children become an issue that had to take seriously by those agencies whose responsibility it had been to expose and combat it, but had chosen not to do so. Even then, Rotherham Council, the main focus of Norfolk's inquiry, attempted to initiate criminal proceedings against him for revealing damning evidence of its collusion with the town's Muslim rape industry. These defensive tactics continued on September 9, 2014, when a House of Commons Select Committee (its proceedings can be seen on YouTube, and its findings on-line) questioned South Yorkshire police and Rotherham council officials as to their role in and knowledge of the scale of sex trafficking and abuse in the borough. Committee members were met with little else but evasions, feigned memory lapses and lies. After claiming to have conducted himself properly in his two roles as a former Rotherham Councillor in charge of children's services, and, at the time of the interview, a Labour South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner with special responsibilities for child protection, Shaun Wright was asked, in the light of his abject failure to live up to his job descriptions, 'what exactly will it take for you to resign?' Wright repeatedly claimed to have not been aware of criminal activities by police serving directly under him, which included the protection of Muslim child rapists.

The question was put to the serving Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police, David Crompton: 'Last week I asked you about the case of an eleven [yes, eleven] year old girl, and having said she had been sexually abused, was found a few weeks later in a derelict house with a number of adult males, yet she was arrested for being drunk and disorderly. I asked you about a 12-year-old girl who had sex with up to five men and the police officer said this had been one hundred per cent consensual in every incident. [Implying, it would seem, that he had been witness to all five rapes]. And I asked you about two fathers who tried to rescue their daughters from being abused and they were arrested themselves. Have you looked into any of this? Do you know who the police officers were?' It transpired that 'the main officer involved in the case had retired some years ago.' Crompton confirmed that a Rotherham police officer had been charged with a sexual offence against a girl of 15. So the police were also 'at it'....one suspects free of charge, in return for their complicity. Corrupt police do not do favours for nothing.

The Telford father of a sexually abused thirteen-year-old girl presented damning and compelling evidence on a YouTube video (*Justice for Amy*) that a rape gang had been paying protection money to the local police force. After tracking

his daughter to a rape premises in a block of flats, and taking her to a hospital to establish medical proof of rape, his daughter was interviewed by the police. They accused her of lying, claiming that she had consented to sexual intercourse, as per the already cited Home Office instruction to police authorities. This was standard procedure in rape gang cases, even though allegedly consensual sex with a minor is still a crime, and police are therefore obliged to investigate it. But they refused. When his daughter's phone was handed over to the police as evidence, it was smashed into six pieces and returned in a box marked 'No examination carried out'. (The video shows the box with its marking and the smashed phone.) Largely through his own efforts, the child's father established that 15 men from the same extended Muslim family had raped his daughter. One of them was prepared to pay £15,000 for the aborted fetus he had fathered in a rape. The girl's father personally witnessed a large brown envelop stuffed with bank notes being handed over in a restaurant by a rape gang member to a man whom he later encountered in a police station...a serving, high ranking officer. Considering the vast revenues generated by the Muslim rape industry, and that not only in Telford, but nearly everywhere else, this industry was allowed to thrive with impunity over decades, we can be sure that Telford's was not the only force on the take.

At the Select Committee inquiry, a description of some of the abuse young girls had been subjected to was read out to Crompton's predecessor, Meredydd Hughes. Children 'were raped by multiple perpetrators, trafficked to other towns in the north of England [courtesy of Rotherham's Muslim cab industry], abducted, beaten...children had been doused in petrol and threatened to be set alight, threatened with guns, made to witness brutally violent rapes and threatened they would be next if they told anyone. Girls as young as eleven were raped by large numbers of male perpetrators.' When these crimes were reported to police, their response, repeating exactly, perhaps not by chance, the wording of the circular issued to all police authorities by the Home Office during the tenure of Labour's Jacqui Smith, was to say that an eleven-year-old girl being gang raped by Muslim men was 'an informed choice'. Asked if he was aware of these crimes being perpetrated on his watch and facilitated by his own officers, Hughes still insisted he had not been 'derelict in my duty', because 'if I had been aware of them, I would have dealt them, because they are criminal acts.' But unfortunately, like Manuel in *Faulty Towers*, he knew nothing. And so Rotherham's rape industry continued to prosper, with more than a little help from its protectors in blue. Hughes' evidence was deemed 'totally unconvincing'. In other words, he was lying.

His colleague, Police Commissioner Wright, was told that a girl who had been a victim of Rotherham's rape industry (one of at least 1,400) claimed she had described to him at a social event 'what I had to do to three Pakistani men in the back of a car', and that 'names were named'. But, 'we never saw him [Wright] again'. When asked if he recalled the encounter, Wright replied that he was 'pretty sure' that if he had that 'conversation', he would have remembered it. Wright was then told that one girl who had been present at the event in question was 'prepared to swear that you were there'. Wright again insisted he was not present at the event, a barbeque for sex abuse victims. None of the Select Committee members believed him and indeed said so. One told him, 'I have attended thousands of committees and sub-committees, but you are the least credible witness I have ever come across. I don't believe what you are saying.... you are a charlatan who is in love with your office and your salary, and you are a disgrace.' The chair of the Committee asked

him to resign, which a matter of days later, he did. Mark this: In the course of the hearing, it was revealed that Rotherham police officers committed criminal acts to frustrate an investigation into the town's rape industry. Files containing damning evidence of police collusion in child sexual abuse were removed overnight from a safe, and two police officers made scarcely veiled death threats against an outside investigator into the same matter.

Joyce Thacker, Director of Rotherham's Children's Services in the period under review (salary, £130,000 per annum) cut no less a wretched figure than the other witnesses, lying and dissembling throughout her testimony. She attributed the failure of her staff to identify the ethnic origins of child abusers to 'fear of raising the issue' in case they were accused of racism, in all probability, by her, their boss. As a result, children were ignored by her department when they reported cases of sexual abuse by Pakistani men. Two members of her staff who tried to secure action on this issue were told to, quote, 'shut up'. Thacker described the prosecution of child rapists as 'the icing on the cake'. But it was she who ensured there was no cake.

Addressing this issue, the Jay Report on child sexual abuse in Rotherham said that child protection staff 'remembered clear direction from their managers' not to identify the race of sexual offenders. At every level, in every agency, the same political correctness ruled. Thacker was the recipient of a 2006 Home Office report on the links between drug, gun (sic!) and sex trafficking and the sexual abuse of young girls in Rotherham. One of the Committee quoted from it: 'Sexual exploitation was very organised, with systematic physical and sexual violence against young women [in fact, young girls], and involved young women being trafficked to other towns and cities predominately in the north, which involved a level of intimidation, physical beatings and rape...' Thacker never acted on that report, passing it on to the police safe in the knowledge that they would do the same, which as we have seen, they did.

The Jay Report listed numerous agencies and committees, employing or involving hundreds of in some case highly paid staff, charged with protecting children from sexual abuse. Even the official Rotherham child care data showed cases loads of sexual abused children running into hundreds. Yet these agencies not only failed to protect them from such abuse but, as we have seen, actively and knowingly facilitated it. For example, in 2014 (that, is, three years after the publication of Norfolk's articles), with Rotherham's rape industry running at full steam, police activity in this area amounted to one prosecution and zero cautions. The number of rapes ran into the tens of thousands.

The final House of Commons Home Affairs Selected Committee report on its investigation into the Rotherham rape industry described the response of public officials to accusations made by its victims. They had, 'in a chilling confirmation of the abusers' blackmail and threats, dismissed the victims – some as young as 12 - as "prostitutes". One care [sic] professional described a girl, 13, as "sexualized" and "dangerous"...she was "glowing with hormones, very confident about her body's power and movement"...She "played the game well" and was, he claimed, a danger "to male members of staff."'. It reads like soft porn, but the words are those of a, quote, 'care professional'. The report continues: 'He was describing a girl who was 11 when she fell victim to men who for three years subjected her to relentless sexual barbarity. 'In its section devoted to the role of the Rotherham police, the Casey Report highlighted what it called their 'phenomenally low

conviction rate' of sexual abusers of children. Their explanation always was, 'we are on to it, don't talk about it because we don't want the perpetrators finding out about our operations.' We have seen what some of these 'operations' amounted to... arresting the victims and their fathers. Casey concluded that 'there seemed [sic] to be lawlessness in relation to CSE [child sexual exploitation] in Rotherham. Perpetrators seemed [sic] to face no consequences. Nor were their activities disrupted... There were numerous occasions in which girls were not believed. They were threatened with [the offence of] wasting police time, they were told they had consented to sex [nevertheless, still a crime] and on one occasion, they were arrested at the scene of the crime, rather than the perpetrators.' In a word, collusion with rape, collusion in some cases with one of the most serious crimes on the statute book, sexual intercourse consensual or otherwise, with a child under the age of 13, one that, I repeat, carries a maximum sentence of life imprisonment, to which I would add castration without anesthetic. And I also repeat, it was a collusion *ordered by the Home Office*. In addition to 'normal' sexual abuse, girls were subjected to 'rape with a broken bottle' and 'ordered to kiss perpetrators' feet at gun point.'

As in Manchester, girls in care were routinely collected at hostels run by Thacker's Children's Services (sic). A girl referred to as 'X' 'was terrified when she was in the hostel. 'She got a text saying that if she didn't come out [to be gang raped] they'd shoot her.' When police were informed, their response was to say, 'why doesn't she switch her phone off?' Death threats with guns...under-age rape?... it's the Pakis again... none of our business. Casey lists numerous similar instances of when accounts of the most appalling sexual intimidation and abuse by Muslim men (and in one case, a woman) inflicted on under-aged girls were either not believed or not taken seriously, in every case, resulting in no action being taken.

Norfolk's investigations, and Peter McLoughlin's, book, *Easy Meat*, (the only study of the subject, so far as I am aware, that does not use the 'Asian' slur to identify Muslim rapists) established beyond any doubt that social services and police complicity in the Muslim rape industry extended well beyond Rotherham and the South Yorkshire Police Authority. Norfolk found evidence that Bradford, with its far larger Muslim 'community' than Rotherham's (31%, the highest of any city in the UK, compared to Rotherham's 4%) had a thriving Muslim rape industry as far back as 1991, though it took more than 20 years before any legal action was taken against it. Bradford West, with a Muslim majority of 51%, is the seat of the fanatically anti-Israel Labour MP Naz Shah, suspended for approving an anti-Semitic tweet in 2017, and, unlike Labour MP Sarah Champion, who paid a political price for speaking out against Muslim sexual abuse of young girls in her Rotherham constituency, preferred to keep a lid on the whole sordid business when she endorsed the spoof tweet cited at the beginning of this chapter. Corbyn awarded her the post of shadow minister for 'women and equalities,' and Starmer, no less laughably, that of 'community cohesion'.

Incredible as it may seem, institutional collusion in the Muslim rape industry extended beyond the police and social service agencies to the criminal Justice system, with its point-blank refusals to take up cases for which the evidence, including one that provided DNA samples taken from a raped child's underwear, was overwhelming. Casey refers to the 'undoubted difficulties [sic] around getting CSE cases into court with the Crown Prosecution Service.' Norfolk gives examples of these 'difficulties' Here is one: 'A girl's mother copied the names, numbers and

text messages of 177 [yes, 177] Asian [sic] men, including [those of] a police officer, from her daughter's mobile phone after the 13-year-old went missing for five days. Police said that using the information as evidence would infringe the girl's and the men's human rights.'

Even on the rare occasions when Muslims charged with sex offences against children went to trial, their sentences could be ludicrously mild, as in the following case of a 12-year-old girl being subjected to an unbroken sequence of three separate rape sessions by nine savages in little more than 24 hours. After being abducted off the street and then raped by three men, she was thrown out of their moving car. A man she asked for help invited her into his home, and then raped her. While he was on the phone inviting his friends to come round and rape her, she escaped. A taxi pulled up. The driver offered to take her to the local police station. Instead, he took her to his house and locked her in a room. Five men arrived to rape her by turns over a period of nearly 24 hours. The man who organised this mass rape served half of a six-year jail sentence, the maximum possible reduction. None of the five rapists was prosecuted. Just imagine what the sentence(s) would have been if the girl was a 12-year-old Muslim, and her abductors and rapists were infidels.

So here we have collusion in Muslim child sexual exploitation, conducted over decades on a massive or, to quote again the Jay Report, 'industrial' scale, by public institutions charged with upholding the law and protecting vulnerable children from abuse, and not so much as a whisper of protest from feminists and leftists either against these crimes or those who facilitated them. Yes, the Socialist Workers Party did hold a demonstration in Rotherham, and had Islam not been the main factor in the equation, it would have been against the sexual abuse of working-class girls and rampant misogyny on the part of the police and a corrupt Labour council. But Islam was, so the SWP demo was not against child rape, but racism and Islamophobia.

Finally, compounding this scandal, to date, no one responsible for these proven gross derelictions of duty (and worse) has been the subject of criminal proceedings. I leave it to the reader to speculate as to why this might be the case.

Please remember Charlene Downes and Laura Wilson, victims of Islamic theology and British political correctness.

Footnotes

In August 2022, it was announced that Rotherham had been nominated as the host of the UK's first Children's Capital of Culture. An excellent choice, if I may so. The dominant culture experienced by the town's most vulnerable children for at least the previous four decades had been that of Islam, with Muslim men raping, on an 'industrial scale', and with the connivance of elected politicians, council officials, social workers and police, well over a thousand schoolgirls, some as young as eleven years of age. I therefore propose that to inaugurate the festivities, the victims of the town's rape industry should parade through the town wearing burkas to conceal their identity, each carrying a large poster with the name and photo of one the 36 men and two women convicted of their abuse, or a name and photo of a public official who presided over it.

On April 6, 2023, the Labour Party launched a vicious personal attack on Tory Prime Minister Rishi Sunak, tweeting the accusation that he did not think child

sex abusers should be jailed. This was after a statement days earlier by Sunak that he intended to crack down on grooming gangs. Labour's claim was based on the record of sentences handed out to those convicted of sex offences against children since the Tories took office in 2010, ignoring the fact that the Muslim rape industry had been operating unhindered throughout the previous four Labour administrations of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown. And in fairness, it should be pointed out that Sunak was first elected an MP in 2015, and first appointed to the cabinet, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, in 2020, this not being an office that has any bearing on sentencing policy. But this was not all. As seen above, Labour's record on this issue was appalling, as demonstrated by the already cited Home Office instruction of 2008 to police authorities in England and Wales not to take criminal proceedings against Muslim grooming and rape gangs and, as we have seen, Labour councils ignoring, and in some cases, colluding in and in individual cases, even participating in the Muslim rape industry.

When criticised for what many, including prominent members of his own party, saw as a tasteless political tactic, Starmer made no apology. In fact, he made it clear there would be more of the same in the lead-up to the council elections due to be held the next month. (Because of the well-deserved backlash, there were none.) While Starmer had accused Sunak for alleged policy failings he was in no sense personally responsible for, some suggested the same could not be said for Starmer. He was appointed Director of Public Prosecutions in July 2008, the same year a Labour Home Office issued the above cited instruction to police, and remained in that position to November 2013, during which time he attended 21 meetings of the Sentencing Council. Agenda item number seven concerned sexual offences against children. The Council recommended that not all convictions for such offences should automatically result in a prison sentence. This seems to me to be a reasonable policy. So why the accusation against Sunak?

In fairness to Starmer, the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee, in the above cited investigation into issues surrounding the Muslim rape industry, commended him for having 'striven to improve the treatment of victims of sexual assault within the criminal justice system throughout his term as Director of Public Prosecutions...His response should be a model to the other agencies involved in tackling localized grooming.' Why then sully that reputation by sanctioning, as he surely must have, the slur against Sunak?

28 Chicken

Native Brits are, by and large, a tolerant, easy-going lot, the young especially, and more so now than ever before, and this is surely a good thing to be. Certainly, far more so than those Muslims who would rather be governed by the laws of a religion that regards unbelievers as inferiors than by those of the country in which they have made their home. The trouble is that in the noble exercise of tolerance, the UK's political representatives and institutions, as in other nations of a similar liberal disposition, sometimes permit and even justify conduct that should not be tolerated. Let us be clear, we are referring to behaviour, not the expression of beliefs and opinions, which should be as much the right of Muslims as anyone else. The toleration by public authorities of abuses both within the 'Muslim community', such as female genital mutilation, bigamous, child and forced marriages and the like, and outside it, with the grooming and gang rape of non-Muslim girls, has multiple causes - political correctness, fear, the courting of the Muslim vote, corruption. Even naivety plays its part, being the mistaken assumption that like everyone who has come to the UK to live, Muslims, despite the inevitable political, cultural, linguistic and religious differences that they bring with them, share essentially the same values, or in time will come to do so, as the host nation. Serious deviations from this norm are therefore ignored or explained away, rather than confronted, which in today's political climate can easily lead to accusations of racism.

We should also bear in mind that until the last thirty years or so, the assumption that the integration of migrant peoples would proceed naturally over the generations has proved to be a sound one. Successive waves of immigration, going back as far as the persecuted Calvinist French Huguenots in the 16th century, have enriched British society in numerous ways and, over time, the descendants of those who first settled in the UK have been integrated and even assimilated by marriage into the society of their hosts. Even when retaining certain elements of their native culture, successive generations have not in any sense mounted a challenge to the UK's political and legal institutions. Being in many cases the victims of persecution in their countries of origin, they were only too willing to embrace a political culture that afforded them not only a safe haven, but equality under the law, a free and decent education for their children, free health care and the opportunity to earn a living and play a part in the democratic process. Tragically for all concerned, the last three decades have provided clear indications that this is not the case with many Muslims. But this was not so initially. The first post-war wave of Islamic immigration into the UK, mainly from Pakistan, was in most ways like those that preceded it. Together with Sikhs and Hindus from India, they found employment, mainly low-paid, in industry and services. The father of Labour's Muslim Mayor, Sadiq Khan, was a bus driver. Many joined trade unions and, obviously in smaller numbers, the Labour Party.

This pioneer generation was as hard working and law abiding as any other migrant group that had made its way to Britain's shores. And while remaining Muslims (though not in the main, excessively devout), and to a large degree (like most newcomers to a strange land) living separate lives from their hosts, there was every reason to assume, based on the history of previous migrations, that if not they, then their children and certainly their grandchildren, would follow the same path of

gradual but irreversible integration. However, it was not to be. External events in the Islamic world, primarily the Middle East and Iran, began to exert what has proved to be an irresistible force of attraction acting on young British Muslims, enticing many to follow a path utterly different from earlier generations. 1979 witnessed Iran's 'Islamic revolution', establishing for the first time in the modern era an Islamic theocracy, and one moreover with political ambitions that reached far beyond its borders. But it was Ayatollah Khomeini's *fatwa* of 1989, the death sentence imposed on Salman Rushdie, that for the first time brought young Muslims on to the streets in their thousands, against a book none had read, but had cheered to see burned, feeling outraged and betrayed by those who defended the author in the name of a freedom of expression that was utterly alien to their religion and culture.

For the first time, young British Muslims were now experiencing the thrill and sense of power that only militant street action and media attention can create. At that moment, the process of integration, so far as the younger generations of Muslims were concerned, came to a halt. Then, in response to the invasion of Iraq in 1991 after Saddam's seizure of Kuwait, followed by 9/11 and the ensuing US-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the integration process went into reverse. Mobilised by two Muslim pressure groups,, the Muslim Council of Britain and the Muslim Association of Britain, this sudden surge of political activism of young Muslims was dragging some of the older generations in its wake. As advocates and even fighters for theocracy, large numbers of young Muslims, unlike the first generation of Islamic migrants, openly began to denigrate man-made democracy and human rights. Again, unlike their forebears, their religious zeal led them to opt out of the UK's political system, preferring to take to the streets in demonstrations against Israel, organised by Corbyn's Palestine Solidarity Campaign and, as we have seen, by answering the call of *Jihad* either in Syria or as 'lone wolf' assassins in the UK.

It must be said that in this respect, they have not been set the best of examples by those of their elders who claim to speak for the UK Muslim diaspora. Some local Muslim politicians have proved to be out and out gangsters, as in the case of Tower Hamlets, and vote riggers, as in Peterborough's council elections of 2004, and by-election of 2019, practices that would not raise an eyebrow in any Islamic state which allows elections but, until the emergence of Muslims onto the political scene, were vitally unknown in the UK. Can it be mere coincidence that all large-scale electoral fraud (tactfully explained by the Electoral Commission as due to a 'lack of understanding of the electoral process') occurs in areas of substantial and long-established Muslim populations? The problem of political corruption is not confined to local politics. As we have seen on several occasions, Muslim politicians at Westminster, when faced with the choice of advancing either their religion or their party, opt for their faith, prompting the suggestion that it would have surely been more honest, and have shown more respect for voters, even if less likely to advance their political careers, if they had stood for office on an Islamic ticket rather than, like the far left, exploit the electoral machine of a mainstream party to which they have no real loyalty.

In politics, as in life generally, there is much wisdom in the old saying that one cannot serve two masters. Faced with the choice of embracing the UK's political culture and institutions, or 'going native', come 9/11 and military clashes erupting between Israel and its Arab and Islamic enemies, many, mainly, young Muslims

opted for the second, setting the stage for the forging of today's anti-Zionist 'popular front'. As we have seen, Muslim support for an avowedly anti-Semitic, even genocidal Islamic Jihadism, with its goal of theocracy, together with hatred for all things western, especially the USA and, of course Israel and the Jews was no longer confined to 'tiny minorities'. Here too, as we have also seen, the Sharia left made the necessary adjustments, simply echoing and justifying even the most racist and primitive prejudices of its young Muslim marching companions. But this was not simply a clash of generations, in the sense of a rite of passage in which the son, to prove his manhood, felt obliged to rebel against his father. It of course included that, but it was so much more. Their revolt was not just against something, but for something, which they truly saw as holy, sacred. In Islam, they found a purpose to not only life, but even more so, death, a cause, a call to action, to *Jihad*, not, like their parents and grandparents, as merely a code to live by and a call to prayer. Azzam Tamimi of the supposedly 'moderate' Sharia left partner, the British Council of Muslims, captured this new-found devotion to the cause perfectly when he objected to the description of Jihadis as 'suicide bombers': 'Do not call them suicide bombers. Call them martyrs. We love death. They [the Jews] love life.'

In the holy texts on which their parents and imams had reared them, young Muslims found a message that, for all the protestations, denials and theological gymnastics of clerics and politicians, was really there, and which undeniably did indeed clearly summon Muslims to do battle, literally, on behalf of their faith. (See Appendix L) Only this, and not the spurious motives others proffer, could explain the surge of young British Muslims who made their way, by devious routes, to the ISIS killing deserts of Syria and Iraq. They left behind them, often for good, and in some cases at least, genuinely bewildered parents, who were at total loss as to why their loved ones were choosing to kill and be killed in a faraway desert rather than achieve academic and professional success, settle down and in time provide then with grandchildren. Always, they described their runaway Jihadi offspring as 'good Muslims', not comprehending for one moment that if they were bad Muslims or not Muslims at all, they would still be safely at home with their parents.

Yet the answer as to why they became assassins was so obvious, so simple, that only a Muslim parent could not grasp it. Brought up from the cradle to be 'good Muslims', that is, to believe that every word of the *Koran* is true, 'good Muslims' was exactly what they believed they were now proving themselves to be, not by study, then beginning a career, followed by buying a home and begetting children, in the process becoming more British than their parents but, just as the *Koran* commanded, by leaving behind the old, the infirm and the fainthearted, and earning by death in battle the rewards that await the martyr in Paradise. As we have seen, that is precisely what the *Koran* urges and promises and, sure enough, devout young Muslims, not just in the UK, but throughout Europe, answered the call in their thousands. The following small selection of verses from the *Koran* urging Jihad are taken from just Chapters 2 and 3. (a fuller selection, numbering 61 is provided in Appendix L) All told, Koranic scholars have identified a total something in the order of 170, though politicians, US academics and Christian clerics, in the first place the current Pope, have detected none:

'Fighting is ordained for you, though it may be repugnant to you.' (2: 217) 'Those who believe and those who emigrate [sic] and strive hard in the cause of Allah, it is these who hope for Allah's mercy.' (2: 219) 'And fight them until there is no more persecution, and religion is professed only for Allah.' (2: 194) 'Do you

suppose that you will enter Heaven while Allah has not yet caused to be distinguished those of you that strive in the way of Allah and has not yet cause to be distinguished as steadfast?' (3: 143) 'We shall cast terror into the hearts of those that have disbelieved.' (3: 152) 'And if you are slain in the cause of Allah or you die, surely forgiveness from Allah and mercy are better than what they hoard.' (3: 158) 'Think not of those, who have been slain in the cause of Allah as dead. nay, they are living in the presence of the Lord, and are granted gifts from him.' (3: 170)

While there is, in defiance of these and many other similar citations, a public consensus among all sectors of the political and clerical establishment that nothing in the teachings of Islam justifies acts of violence, this does not hold true for the criminal justice system and in its courts of law, where evidence and the truth still matter. We have seen that in a number of cases involving Muslims charged with terrorism offences, evidence presented in court by the prosecution to prove criminal intent has included passages from the *Koran* which defendants had invoked to justify acts of terror against infidels. At least here, evidence, realism and a refusal to defer to political correctness still prevailed. The same is however not true of the Prison Service. In July 2016, the BBC reported that after a review of prison libraries conducted in 2015 by a team led by Ian Acheson, a senior Home Office official and former prison governor, five Islamic texts stocked by libraries were identified as 'extremist' for their advocacy of Jihadism. In nine of the eleven prisons inspected, one or more of these texts had been found in chaplaincy rooms. Acheson first conveyed his concerns to the Ministry of Justice in November 2015, and again in March 2016, but to no effect. The release of his report on his findings was also repeatedly delayed. The order to remove the texts in question was eventually made on June 20, 2016. Perhaps one of the reasons for the delay in publication and action was that one of the texts Acheson believed was responsible for encouraging Jihadism contained numerous citations from the *Koran*., some of which I include in Appendix L. Giving evidence to the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee, Acheson expressed both unease and surprise that the Ministry of Justice had taken so long to act on his recommendations: 'I made it clear to the Ministry of Justice last November that my assumption was that urgent action will be taken to remove these materials. Their free access to vulnerable and suggestible prisoners is an obvious security risk.' Could it be that political correctness was taking precedence even over national security?

Among the texts scheduled for removal was *The Way of Jihad* [sic!] by the Hitler-admiring founder of the theocratic Muslim Brotherhood, Hassan Al-Banna. In his preface, the author asserts that '*Jihad* is an obligation from Allah on every Muslim and cannot be ignored or evaded'. In the main body of the work, Al-Banna then cites certain passages from the *Koran* that validate this claim, for example: 'Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into the hearts of the enemies of Allah and your enemies', (8: 60) and 'Verily Allah has purchased of the believers their lives and their properties; for the price that is theirs shall be the Paradise. They fight in Allah's cause, so they kill others and are killed.' (9: 11) UK tax-paying readers may be interested to learn that this particular verse, one that like so many others from the same source, incites Muslims to kill non-Muslims, has been included in the Ministry of Justice-approved manual for Islam courses taught in HM prisons since 2011. (Why such courses are needed is another question.) Given that the *Koran* contains over a hundred similar injunctions to take up arms for Allah, for the ban

on Jihadist literature to be truly effective, Islam's holiest text would have to be removed from every prison in the UK, or expurgated to render it innocuous.

No less a matter of concern to Acheson was the discovery that of the 244 Muslim chaplains operating within the prison system, no fewer than two thirds were adherents of the Deobandi school of Islam, which also controls around 40% of the UKs registered 1,750 mosques and many of its 2,000 *madrassahs*. Preaching its own version of multi-culturalism, Deobandism advocates the strictest possible segregation of diaspora Muslims from their *kuffar* hosts and, sharing a close association with Wahhabism, promotes *Jihad* against the infidel West. Particularly influential in Pakistan and Afghanistan, its teachings inspired the founding of the Taliban. One of its private schools, situated in the heavily Islamised former Yorkshire mill town of Dewsbury, was found by a Sky News investigation to be inculcating in its 140 pupils the belief that there existed a Jewish conspiracy to conquer the world, an exercise justified by the school's management as 'spiritual training for the soul'. The school also prepared its pupils for martyrdom in the name of Islam, with teaching materials exhorting Muslims to 'expend even life for Allah's just order'. Is it any wonder then that 1,000 or so young UK Muslims, exposed on such a scale to these doctrines, in many cases learned from early childhood by rote at *madrassahs*, turned ISIS Jihadis, comprising possibly the largest contingent, one quarter of the total, from any western country?

What hope integration when so many of a rising generation see as their role models Jihadis who video beheadings to cries of god is great? Surely it is time to realise that after the UK has done everything within reason and, in pursuing the follies of 'multi-culturalism', even beyond, to accommodate the followers of Islam, infidels are now seen by many Muslims, and with some justification, as contemptible *dhimmi* dupes. There is nothing personal, as the saying goes, about a Muslim's negative attitude towards his or her *kuffar* hosts. It is commanded by the *Koran*: 'Surely the vilest of animals in Allah's sight are those who disbelieve.' (Chapter 8, Verse 55) 'Ye who believe take not the Jews and the Christians as friends' (Chapter 5, Verse 52); and 'O ye who believe, take not others than your own people as intimate friends; they will spare no pains to ruin you. They love to see you in trouble. Hatred has already shown itself through the utterances of their mouths and what their breasts hide is greater still.' (Chapter 3, Verse 119) It is difficult, if not impossible, to see how these condemnations and commands can further the process of integration of young Muslims into the broader society in which they or their antecedents have chosen to live, especially when they are also incited by their leaders to do exactly the opposite. In 2008, the then Turkish Prime Minister, and now Islamising President Recep Erdogan addressed a meeting of 20,000 diaspora Turks in Cologne: 'I understand very well that you are against assimilation. One cannot expect you to assimilate. Assimilation is a crime against humanity.'

Faced with this organised resistance to integration, the response of public policy has been to accommodate the demands, laws and mores of Islam, a policy that in Sweden, resulted in native Swedes effectively being reduced to second class citizens in what was once their own country. (For details, see Appendix C) One of the most frequently rehearsed explanations for the failure of Muslims to integrate is that the young in particular feel 'alienated', as if this was somehow not the inevitable consequence of Islamic teachings and diaspora preferences, but the fault of the host nation. One way to respond to this complaint is to offer the Muslims of

the UK an alternative to the status which they, along with all other UK subjects, currently enjoy or rather, complain of. The deal would go like this. The UK would offer to its resident Muslims a carbon copy of the same Sharia law that a true Islamic state would impose on *dhimmi* non-Muslims in its own domain. As a legally Christian country with its own state church, the UK would confront Muslims with three choices, just as Islam does non-Muslim monotheists: convert to Anglicanism, accept the second-class status of Muslim *dhimmis* and pay the tax, or suffer death as Muslim martyrs. (There would also be a fourth option of emigration within in a set time period.) Any Muslim converting to Anglicanism and then reverting back to Islam would be killed as an apostate. By strictly enforcing an inverted carbon copy of Islamic *dhimmitude*, non-converting Muslims accepting this status, in addition to paying the *dhimmi* tax, would not be allowed to

- 1: build any new Mosques in the UK;
- 2: pray or read out aloud from sacred Muslims texts in any place where this may be heard by Anglicans;
- 3: reproduce Islamic holy texts, and sell them in public places;
- 4: Display religious symbols on their houses or places of worship;
- 5: Use the media in any shape or form to promote their faith;
- 6: Gather in public for a religious purpose;
- 7: To serve in the armed forces, unless engaged as mercenaries under Anglican command.

If these conditions of servitude were to be enforced on the UK's Muslim population, it would not be too hard to predict the inevitable reactions. In the UK, there would ensue entirely legitimate Muslim massive protests, joined by many others who shared their outrage at these measures. I would be among them. They could quite easily spill over into violent clashes in several of the UK's largest cities. There would be a world-wide Muslim boycott of all UK goods and services. Ambassadors of Muslim countries would be withdrawn. The UN which, by accepting without protest a religious monopoly of Islam in Saudi Arabia, violates its own Universal Declaration of Human Rights, would convene an emergency session to protest against the UK's violation of Islamic religious freedom, while its Human Rights Council would also call an emergency session to pass scathing resolutions of condemnation and find the UK guilty of umpteen human rights violations.

The Arab League and the Organisation of the Islamic Conference would likewise convene emergency sessions to the same end. Overnight, the UK would become a pariah state in the eyes of not only Muslims but the entire world. Abroad, vast armies of outraged Muslims would storm and reduce to rubble UK embassies in fifty or more Islamic capitals. The mayhem, destruction and carnage would dwarf any that Muslim mobs have unleashed in past responses to a cartoon, a film or novel most had neither seen, read or could have read. And all because the UK had decided to treat Muslims in the same way that Sharia law and the *Koran* require Islamic states to treat those who are not Muslims. And yet there never have been, and probably never will be, analogous resolutions, boycotts and street mobilisations against the very real and mounting persecution of religious minorities imposed in countries governed by Sharia law, under which religious toleration, like so many other aspects of Islam, is a one-way street, demanded as of divine right by Muslims

in the lands of the infidel, but denied by Allah to infidels in his own realm: 'Fight them [the unbelievers] until there is no more persecution [of Muslims] and religion is professed only for Allah.' (*Koran*, Chapter 2, Verse 194)

Sometimes, 'Islamisation' has its absurd, even comic aspects, though the following examples also have a deadly serious dimension, since they illustrate the mounting assault being mounted by Islam, with the connivance of a range of public authorities, on the increasingly restricted to right to free speech. That offensive has resulted in a series of court rulings and convictions in the UK that are flagrant violations of Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, to which the UK was a signatory, but which in order to appease its Eurosceptics, the Conservative Party committed itself to repudiating. Article 10 is defined thus:

Everyone [sic] has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers. In a commentary on this article arising from case law, the Court has ruled that Article 10 'protects not only the information and ideas that are regarded as inoffensive but also those that shock, offend or disturb, such as the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broad mindedness without which there is no democratic society.' Opinions expressed in strong or exaggerated language are also protected.

In Article 10 of the European Convention, yes, but not in the courts of the UK where they can be judged as crimes meriting in some cases prison terms of up to seven years. In the May 2014 elections for the EU Parliament, a candidate for the anti-Islam Liberty GB Party was reading out aloud from a book by Winston Churchill while standing on the steps of the Winchester Guildhall. The work in question was Churchill's *River War*, an account of the British campaign against the Sudanese Mahdi at the close of the 19th century, in which Churchill played a prominent role as an army officer. The work, containing views arrived at through first-hand experience of the Islamic faith (see Appendix I) and its impact on those who adhere to it, would, by today's less robust standards of what constitutes free speech, certainly qualify as 'Islamophobic'. And so it proved. The reading was brought to an abrupt halt following a complaint to the police by a Guildhall official, who almost certainly was unaware of the identity and therefore legendary reputation of its Nobel Literature Prize winning author, whose leadership in the Second World resulted (deservedly in my opinion) in his being voted the 'Greatest Briton' by BBC viewers, and is the only British commoner ever to have been awarded a state funeral. No matter. Charged with the offence of 'religious *and* racial harassment' no less, even though the reading made no reference to race, only Islam, and the complaint had not been made by a 'harassed' Muslim, the offender was arrested, searched (presumably for more incriminating writings by Churchill) and bundled into a van by a *posse* of no fewer than seven policemen. After having his fingerprints taken, providing a DNA sample and spending several hours in a cell, he was released, still facing racial hate speech charges carrying a maximum prison sentence of two years. Though the charges were subsequently dropped, the fact that they had led to an arrest is an indication that Islam is being afforded a level of legal protection not accorded to any other belief system.

Naturally, the Thought Police action won approval from Muslims, for whom free speech exists only to propagate Islam and to demand the silencing and punishment

of those who dare to criticise it. Mohammed Shafiq of the Ramadan Foundation, whom we earlier encountered demanding of infidels not only respect for but the 'celebration' of his faith, put it thus: 'Of course [sic] there should be freedom of speech, but [there is always a 'but'] with freedom of speech comes responsibility'. How easily 'of course' trips from the tongue. Translated from an Orwellian Shariaspeak into less opaque and more honest prose, Shafiq was saying that we Muslims do not like criticism of our religion, and so we demand the right to be the judges of what can and cannot be said about it. As Rafiq was well aware, that is exactly how the matter is handled in Islamic countries, where freedom of speech and religion are only conspicuous by their total absence. The Shafiqs of this world want the same system of censorship to operate in the west, in the guise of demanding 'responsible' free speech. Who decides what is 'responsible'? Who enforces it? And 'responsible' to whom? We can guess. The only responsibility that comes with free speech is firstly to defend it, come what may, and to exercise it, irrespective of whom it may offend. Free speech qualified by a 'but', as it so often is, is no longer free speech. One can easily imagine what the reaction of a genuine feminist would be to any man who said 'of course I am against wife-beating, but...'

In fairness, I should point out that this duplicitous stance on the right to free expression is shared by many non-Muslims, not least those on the left. When, some twenty-five or so years ago, in an article on Lenin that I wrote for the quasi-Trotskyist *New Interventions*, I took the Bolshevik leader to task for reneging on his party's pre-revolution pledge to uphold freedom of the press 'to its last drop of blood', the journal's editor replied in the next issue that 'Yes, we are all for freedom of the press, but Blick does not seem to consider that in some circumstances certain newspapers should be closed down'. George Orwell would have loved that one! In the same breath, 'all for' and 'close down'. What these 'circumstances' might be, and the identity of the 'certain papers', was left unsaid, though the principle and object of the exercise itself were manifestly clear. Should we then be surprised that given this shared denial of the unqualified right to freedom of expression, the Leninoid totalitarian left and far right theocratic Islam would prove such amicable bed-fellows? To take two examples. Um Ibtihal, in the website *Islamic City*, after noting with concern that some Muslims living under repressive Islamic regimes are attracted to the idea of freedom of speech, made it clear that 'Islam does not allow the adoption and propagation of "Freedom of Speech" as propagated in the West, since this would permit the promotion of such ideas that contradict Islam'. He then (again) invokes the Henry Ford 'black car' principle: 'This is not to say that Islam does not allow the Muslims to express their opinions freely.' However, that is exactly what it does do, as what follows, makes clear: 'But [always the 'but'] this opinion must be derived from the *Koran* and *Sunna* [words and deeds] of the prophet Mohammed'. So much for 'freely' - just like the editor of *New Interventions*, any opinion you like, so long as it is Islamic, or his case, Leninist. Our second commentary is to be found in the Islamic website '*Brotherhood and Unity*'. And yes, it is indeed the precise theocratic analogue of Lenin's post-revolution dictum that press freedom, far from being the birth right of the proletariat, 'helps the force of the world bourgeoisie'. Freedom of speech, we are informed, only this time by Muslim, is 'a colonial tool', a concept

derived from the capitalist [sic] ideology that is based on the belief that God and religion should be separated from life's affairs...the right to speak and what are the

limits of free speech are therefore all defined by human beings. This view completely contradicts Islam. In Islam, it is the creator of all human beings, Allah, who gave the right [surely, in view of the context, faculty] of speech to people and the limits on what is acceptable and unacceptable speech.

Muslims who might be tempted to venture beyond these limits are warned that Allah has installed a celestial Sharia Big Brother audio monitoring system by which 'every word a human being speaks is recorded by the two angels Kiraman [and] Katibeen' so that 'even the speaking of one "bad" word may lead someone to the hellfire.' While being resolutely opposed, like Lenin, to unfettered 'colonialist' and 'capitalist' free speech, and yet always demanding that 'capitalist', 'colonialist' laws be used to silence and punish those that fail to display the required respect for their faith, Islamic clerics expect the *kuffar's* police to protect them when they exercise their Allah-given right to applaud acts of terror against this same 'colonial' and 'capitalist' enemy. And of course, our *dhimmi* police duly obliged. The date was September 11, 2002, the location, Jeremy Corbyn's favourite Finsbury Park Mosque, and the event, a celebration of the first anniversary of the killing by 19 Muslims of nearly 3,000 victims in their suicide attack on the Pentagon and the World Trade Centre in New York. Around 1,000 Muslims crowded into the mosque to celebrate mass murder, pray to their warrior god and hear sermons of hate against the west. On this occasion, however, the police were there to protect the exercise of what they evidently regarded as 'responsible' freedom of speech, unlike a Churchill text criticising Islam, which belonged to the 'irresponsible' category.

Travelling west from Winchester, we find ourselves at Taunton in Somerset. There, Michael Overd, a Christian lay street preacher, was arrested and charged, under one of the UK's speech crime laws, with preaching a 'religiously aggravated' sermon, ironically the identical fate that befell the founder of his religion, if the Biblical account of his life is anything to go by. It is difficult to see how Overd's guilt could have been in any doubt, in the light of the testimony given by one witness for the prosecution. The preacher had, she claimed, made 'defamatory comments' about Mohammed and, horror of horrors, made 'no mention of any good' in the Islamic faith. So, cuff him. The legal implications of this trial were potentially truly horrendous, that in order to remain within the law, public speakers could be obliged to balance any adverse comments they might dare to make about Islam with an equal number that are favourable, even if it involved, as it necessarily would, inventing them. There is also another aspect of this prosecution that needs to be considered. As we have already noted, the 57 Islamic members of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference had been pressing for the United Nations to make it a criminal offence, binding on and enforceable within all its 193 member countries, to defame Islam and its prophet. The Taunton trial was just that, a blasphemy trial by another name, in which adverse comments made about Islam and Mohammed were regarded as sufficient evidence to warrant criminal proceedings against the person who made them.

As *kismet* would have it, how appropriate that the presiding judge in this trial should be a Muslim, Shamim Qureshi, who in his other legal capacity, played a leading role as a judge in the UK's publicly financed and gender-biased Sharia court system. All this was bad enough. But what followed was worse again. Before Overd had even begun his sermon, it transpired that a police officer had warned him, 'If I hear one homophobic word out of your mouth here today, I will arrest you'. Quite

aside from the contentious issue of how a single word can be 'homophobic', there is the more important matter to consider of a police officer, note book or perhaps recording device in hand, monitoring every single word uttered by a public speaker, and ready to pounce if, in his judgement, just one of those words violated a speech crime law. No less a cause for concern was the same police officer's warning to Overd that though he had a right to free speech, this had to be exercised without offending anyone, precisely the kind of 'responsible free speech' Muslims seek, with the support of the far left, to enforce on those who do not share their exalted opinion of Islam.

Then there is another question. How can anyone addressing a gathering of people whose beliefs and opinions cannot possibly be known in advance to the speaker, be able, with the certainty demanded by this officer, to guarantee that they will not say anything that could offend anyone in the audience? This is impossible. The only way to comply with this instruction is to say nothing, which is exactly the result Muslim offence-takers seek. But there is more. Finally, we come to what must be the most alarming feature of the many that comprised this judicial assault on free thought and its free expression. A police officer present in court took time out to speak to the journalists who were covering the trial. He invited them, in words that cannot be construed in any other way, to encourage the public, as they were in Nazi and then Stalinist [East] Germany, to become informers on their fellow citizens. This, verbatim, is what the officer said: 'I'd advise people that if they are offended to record any incident on their mobile phone and send it to us.' Does this require any comment?

In the event, Overd was found guilty of using 'abusive' language and ordered not only to pay the costs of his trial, rated at £1,200, but damages to one of the passers-by whom, it was claimed, he had offended, to the tune of £250. If this is not an incentive, indeed, an incitement, to be offended, what is? He rightly chose to appeal against his conviction and elected to stand trial again before a jury. That the Sharia judge found the preacher guilty is in itself outrageous enough, as was his financial reward to the allegedly offended party for choosing to be offended. But his closing remarks had a sinister ring that those who value what remains of their civil liberties can ill afford to ignore. In the course of his sermon, Overd had quoted from the Old Testament of the Bible, Leviticus, Chapter 20, Verse 13: 'If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall be surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.' As it was reading out aloud this particular verse that helped secure the preacher's conviction, the Muslim judge told Overd that he should have selected another verse instead. This was indeed rich coming a judge whose own religion, to say the very least, has a no less condemnatory attitude towards homosexuality than the Bible's, and to this day punishes it with the same penalty. He also warned Overd that his offence carried the option of a prison sentence...*for reading from the Bible*. So, just as in the Churchill case, the courts can if they choose prosecute and, if they see fit, convict anyone reading aloud in public a passage from a book that is not only in general circulation but, in this case, in its King James version, is beyond any dispute the prime text in the English language and, in various versions, is still to be found in the UK in millions of homes, including my own, thousands of public and academic libraries, in schools and hotels, and in every Anglican Church, from which are made readings no different from that of Overd's, in all serious bookshops and, what is more, is still the chief doctrinal authority of the established Church of

England, at whose head stands the *Fidei Defensatrix*, His Majesty King Charles. A Judge, a *Muslim* judge of all people, tells a Christian preacher what can and cannot be read out from this book in public. Just imagine the reverse, a Christian judge, or better still, a Jewish one, giving the same instruction to a Muslim preacher! How have we managed to abase ourselves to the point when a pathological fear of anyone giving offence results in a preacher being arrested and convicted for reading from the Bible? Although the guilty verdict was on appeal overturned at Bristol Crown Court, there was a sting in the tail. When, subsequently, Overed commendably brought a civil action in the same court against Avon and Somerset police for, quote, ‘wrongful arrest, battery, trespass to the person, malicious prosecution, misfeasance in public office and infringement of human rights’ (magnificent), the judge dismissed all these claims on the grounds that the police had acted lawfully! If so, why then was the verdict overtured?

However, the speech police were found to have acted unlawfully in the following three cases, each involving a Christian street preacher. In February 2019, a Nigerian Pastor, Oluwole Ilesanmi, was arrested and handcuffed by two police officers while preaching outside Southgate underground station following a complaint by a member of the public. One of the arresting officers confiscated his bible, and told him that by criticising Islam, he was disturbing the peace. A passer-by videoed the officer saying: ‘No one wants to hear that. They [sic] want you to go away.’ Even though not formally charged with any offence, he was then bundled into a police car and driven several miles away from the tube station. He was then released from the car, again, without any charge being brought against him. Following a complaint by the preacher, he was awarded £2,500 for damages regarding his wrongful arrest.

In April 2021, police arrested, handcuffed and frog marched to a police car another Pastor, 71 year old John Sherwood, who had been preaching outside Uxbridge underground station. They were responding to complaints that he had been making, as the police put it, ‘homophobic comments’. What he had been doing, had those ignoramuses who made the complaints known it, was reading from the same Leviticus, Chapter 20, Verses 13. Pastor Sherwood was taken to a police station, and then released without charge. Once again, publicly reading from the Bible, the foundational text of England’s official religion, had proved to be sufficient grounds for arrest in the UK, as it once was in the Soviet Union, and still is in countries ruled by Sharia law, not to speak of Andrew Murray’s ‘People’s Korea’, the world’s only official atheist state. Somehow, I cannot conceive of a similar response if the reading on the same subject had been from the *Koran* or a *hadith*.

In December 2020, police arrested Hatun Tash, an evangelist preacher, at Hyde Park’s Speakers Corner, once a bastion of free speech. She was charged (as it proved, illegally) with violating Covid restriction rules. A second arrest took place in May 2021 at the same location, this time on a charge of ‘breaching the peace’, despite the fact that just before her arrest, she had been verbally abused, threatened and *physically assaulted* by a group of Muslim men for wearing a T shirt with an image of Mohammed. No action was taken against her abusers. She was taken into custody, interviewed under caution at a police station and held in a police cell for 24 hours. Tash successfully contested both arrests, and was awarded £10,000 compensation.

An almost identical fate befell a group of street preachers in Redditch, as reported in the Redditch and Alcester Advertiser of December 12, 2020. A group of Christian Street preachers proclaiming that ‘homosexuals are going to hell’ were reported to the police by a member of the public. ‘They had placards saying “all sinners are going to burn in hell” ...I turned around and challenged them and said they can’t cherry-pick scriptures from the Bible to suit their bigoted beliefs. [Who says they can’t? Clergymen do it every Sunday.] I said they were nothing but bigoted racists [first Muslims were a race, and now, gays are] and had no right to spout hate speech in public. Then I called 101.’ (101 was, by happenstance, also the number of the room where those guilty of Thought Crime were subjected to torture by Big Brother in Orwell’s *1984*.) Once again, the speech police arrived who after taking evidence from our public-spirited citizen, stated they that ‘an investigation was under way.’ On this occasion too there were no convictions. But the fact that on four occasions, public Christian preaching had led, at the very least, to police action, in two cases, judged to be illegal, raised some very serious questions about the status of free speech in the UK. What law says it can be a crime to quote in public from the Bible? Is it not the teaching of the holy book of the Church of England that unrepentant sinners go to hell, and that homosexual acts are sinful? If this can be preached in an Anglican church, and the relevant Biblical texts ‘cherry-picked’ as readings for a lesson, why not in public? For example, in addition to Leviticus we have Romans 1: 27, which refers to the sin of men who, ‘leaving the natural use [sic] of women, burned in their lust toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly...’ Is it now one of the responsibilities of our understaffed and funded police to determine which Biblical cherries can or cannot be picked in public? Speech policing of Christians is not confined to the UK. Objections to the same Leviticus passage on homosexuality, this time photocopied from a Bible and displayed on line, led in January 2022 to the trial in Finland of a Lutheran MP on a charge of ‘hate speech’, despite the text in question, as in England, constituting part of the doctrine of Finland’s established Lutheran church. It was left to the court to decide if quoting from the Bible could constitute a crime. Why not cut to the chase, and ban it, as they do in Saudi Arabia? In the event, in keeping with Finland’s liberal traditions and values, the jury said it could not.

Now to that religious hot spot, Belfast, where, on 18 May 2014, another preacher, this a professional one, Pastor James McConnel, delivered in his church a sermon that he also publicised on-line. Its subject was Muslim persecution of Christians, and everything he said about their sufferings and the religion of their persecutors was true:

Allah is a heathen deity. Allah is a cruel deity. Allah is a demon deity. A deity that this foolish government of ours pays homage to and subscribes financial inducements to curry their favour, while in Muslim lands Christians are persecuted for their faith. Their homes are burned, their churches destroyed, and hundreds [in fact thousands] of them literally have given their lives for Christ in martyrdom. A lovely young Sudanese woman by the name of Miriam, 27 years of age, because she has accepted Christ as her Saviour, will be flogged publicly and hanged publicly...I know the time will come in this land and in this nation when to say such things will be an offence to the law.... Islam is satanic. Islam is a doctrine spawned in hell.

The time he warned of had already arrived. In fact it had come more than a decade previously, as the Pastor quickly discovered, when, acting on a complaint by the Belfast Islamic Centre, police charged him under a totalitarian thought crime law, dating from 2003, with the offence, which carries a prison term of up to six months, of 'sending, or causing to be sent, by means of a public electronic communication network, a message or other matter that was grossly offensive'. Speaking the truth about Muslim persecution and murder of Christians 'grossly offensive'? No such proceedings ensued when Channel Four exposed calls by Birmingham imams for the murder of homosexuals and Muslims who did not pray the required number of times per day. Instead, it was Channel Four who were the subject of an eight months investigation by the CPS, accused of distorting the message of the preachers' sermons. (See Chapter 16)

Pastor McConnell, unlike many of our higher clerics, was made of sterner stuff than the clerical quislings who turn a deaf ear to cries for help from their Christian brothers and sisters, hunted down, enslaved, raped, tortured and murdered in their thousands for their faith by the zealots of the religion of peace, compassion and tolerance. Unrepentant for expressing views that are integral to his own chosen faith, he made it clear that the target of his invective was not people, but ideas that he sincerely believed to be both false and wicked: 'I have nothing against Muslims. I have never hated Muslims. But I am against what Muslims believe.' My view exactly. He continues: 'They have a right to say what they believe in and I have a right to say what I believe in'. If only this last were true! His prosecution, and others like it, proved that when the subject is Islam, it is not. Rather than accept the option of a lesser punishment, Pastor McConnell elected to stand trial, and was ready to risk a six-month term in prison: 'I am 78 years of age and in ill health but jail has no fear for me. They can lock me up with sex offenders, hoodlums and paramilitaries and I will do my time.' In which event, would the *dhimmi* Amnesty International have adopted him as a Prisoner of Conscience?

Obviously more concerned to placate Belfast's allegedly outraged Muslims than permit freedom of speech and conscience to its Christian preachers, the Prosecution announced that it would be calling no fewer than eight (we can safely assume, all deeply-offended Muslim) witnesses. This was obviously a test case, and the Belfast Islamic Centre intended to win it. The Centre's Executive Director Raied al-Wazzam told the BBC that the Pastor's sermon had contained 'inflammatory language and it is definitely not acceptable'. Acceptable to whom? Here we have the Islamic veto being exercised yet again, with a Muslim laying down the (Sharia) law as to what can and cannot be said by non-Muslims about Islam, not only in a non-Islamic country, but one that is officially Christian. He and others like him were, with the full support of the law courts, deciding what constituted 'acceptable' or, as another cleric put, 'responsible' speech, the criteria always being, what is acceptable to Muslims under Sharia law. With each new case, entire branches of UK law were, by stealth and precedent, not only accommodating Sharia law, but becoming extensions of it. Raied al Wazzam had complained of the Pastor's 'inflammatory language'. He should know. Some months later, in January 2015, he gave another interview to the BBC, in which he proclaimed himself to be an admirer of the Islamic State: 'Since the Islamic State took over Mosul, it has been the most peaceful city in the world'.

With such impeccable theological credentials, it was only to be expected that Raied al Wazzam would be chosen by the CPS as its chief witness in the trial of

Pastor McConnel. I am pleased to record that on this occasion, Pastor McConnel was found not guilty by a judge who, by his verdict, obviously placed a higher value on free speech than appeasing professional Muslim offence takers. Even so, the Pastor would have been outraged to learn, if he did not already know it, that as the law on 'hate crime' has thus far been interpreted, it could be a crime for a person to burn in public, without endangering either property or other persons, their own copy of a *Koran*, while the same did not hold true for a copy of the Bible. In November 2010, a 15-year-old Birmingham school girl was arrested and accused of 'inciting religious hatred' after burning a *Koran* in her school's playground. Two months previously, after being 'tracked down' by the *Daily Mail* (as the paper proudly reported) six masked Gateshead men were arrested after posting a video of themselves burning a copy of the *Koran* in a protest against 9/11.

Commenting on the two cases, Catherine Heseltine, Chief Executive Officer of the Muslim Public Affairs Committee, explained that 'the *Koran* is the most sacred thing to over a billion Muslims worldwide...we will never destroy the Koranic texts'. Nobody was saying they should. As her 'we' clearly refers to Muslims, and Muslims alone, it therefore follows that non-Muslims are in no sense, legally or otherwise, obliged to display the same reverence for a book that they do not believe in. If someone chooses to burn their own property in the shape of a book in a manner that is totally legal in all other respects, that should be entirely their own affair, as indeed it is in the USA under the First Amendment. It is also allowed in the UK, when the book is *The Satanic Verses* and those burning it, in public, are Muslims, but not when the book in question is the *Koran*, and those burning it are infidels. Defending the right to do something, as I do in this instance, is not the same as approval of the said act, a distinction most Muslims and now our courts simply seem incapable of making. Although there was no place in Rousseau's Utopia for a free press, he is justly famed for his retort, when it was one of his own writings, the novel *Emile*, that was consigned to the flames by the Calvinists of Geneva, that 'burning is no answer'. Book burning, historically associated with the Roman Catholic Inquisition and the Nazis, and more recently with Muslim mobs outraged by a book they had not read (and in most cases, could not have read) or an image they have probably not seen, is not only stupid, futile and uncivilised, but demonstrates a refusal or inability to engage rationally with ideas with which one disagrees. But that should not be grounds for making it a crime when it is one's own book that is being destroyed without risk to persons or property. Here again in such cases, we see a blatant attempt by UK law officers to use the courts to enforce Sharia blasphemy laws.

Just how menacing these legal restrictions on free expression have become (all of which, significantly, have a religious dimension) was demonstrated by another extraordinary case that came to court in the UK in March 2015. As we have seen over and again, politicians in the UK, as they do world-wide, insist there is no causal connection between Islam and terrorism, and anyone who makes such a linkage is guilty of defaming the religion of peace. But it seems there can be exceptions to this otherwise universal truth. And, as we might have expected, these exceptions, far from allowing the defaming of Islam, work in its favour. To appreciate how, consider the following: In that month, Liam Edwards appeared in Manchester Magistrates court, charged with 'racially aggravated criminal damage'. From the wording, one would reasonably infer that Edwards had maliciously damaged in some way, property belonging to a member of an ethnic group other than his own,

and that his motive for doing so was that of racial hatred. But one would be wrong. Nothing of the kind occurred. Not remotely. Describing himself as an 'animal lover', and like millions of other non-Muslims, though not the *dhimmi* Green Party, Edwards was opposed to the unnecessarily cruel ritual slaughter of animals, having witnessed it in a TV documentary on the subject. Seeking to draw attention to the issue, he entered a Sainsbury supermarket, and affixed stickers to *Halal* products and supermarket trolleys belonging to Sainsbury, which read thus: 'Beware! Halal is barbaric and funds terrorism. Ban Halal'. While the first accusation was a matter of opinion, the later has been proven to be true.

The entire case against Edwards rested on these words printed on the stickers, and nothing that he had said or, apart from affix his stickers, done. There was no allusion to, let alone mention of, a race or races on the stickers. Terrorism is not a race any more than is *halal* meat or a supermarket trolley. That is why Edwards only pleaded guilty to criminal damage, as not all the stickers could be removed from the *Halal* products, resulting in a loss to Sainsbury of £16.50 in sales revenue. But he pleaded not guilty to the 'aggravated racial' component of the charge, which was referred to trial by jury at a later date. As his defence council correctly pointed out in support of his not guilty plea, 'he used the word terrorism, but that cannot denote race or indeed religion'. Indeed, it cannot. And are we not told over and again that there is no connection between Islam and terrorism? But here is the ironic twist to the whole affair; the prosecution case rested on the assumption that there was! The additional objection could have been made that such 'damage' as there was done was to the property of Sainsbury, a company, and not a race, a point that I will expand on below. The specific charge brought against Edwards in this case, '*racially aggravated* criminal damage', carries with it the implication that just the combined public display of the words 'halal' and 'terrorism' could be actionable in a court of law, for otherwise, why was Edwards not simply charged with criminal damage? And why introduce 'race' into the proceedings, when the alleged allusion was to a religion? One suspects that this case has a great deal more to do with protecting the 'sensitivities' of Sainsbury's Muslim customers than the loss of £16.50 to Sainsbury shareholders, a loss that was readily made good by Edwards being required by the court to pay this sum in damages to the company, which he did.

The sane amongst us are left puzzling: How does a sticker, one that mentions neither Islam nor a race, but refers disapprovingly to a method of killing animals, and makes the allegation (not surely in and of itself a criminal offence, and for which there were moreover reasonable grounds) that revenues from the *Halal* meat industry were funding terrorism, constitute a *racially* motivated offence? If, in the eyes of law, it does, then which race is being aggravated, so to speak? Bear in mind that the stickers were attached to chickens and trolleys legally belonging to Sainsbury. So, was Sainsbury claiming not only to have suffered damage to its property (which in the case of the chickens was true and conceded to be such by the defendant) but also to have had inflicted upon its (dead) chickens '*racially aggravated*' damage, rather than just damage *per se*? Was Sainsbury, a company, claiming either itself, its trolleys or its chickens to be a race? Surely not. Yes, it was their property that was damaged, but precisely who had been 'racially aggravated' remained a mystery. Let us assume for sanity's sake that it was not Sainsbury, its trolleys or (dead) chickens, that had been the victim suffering the 'racially aggravated' component of the charge, but rather that a Muslim customer had made a complaint to the effect that they had been 'racially aggravated' on reading the

offending sticker, even though, as we have noted, there was no reference to Islam or even allusion to race in the wording. So, if my assumption is correct, we have damage to Sainsbury property in the form of one or more chickens, but no 'racial aggravation' to the same party; and a presumed 'racial aggravation' to a hypothetical Muslim customer or customers (no such customer was called as a witness) of an unspecified and therefore possibly same race as the accused, but no damage to a potential customer's property, since the damaged chicken(s), being unsellable, still belonged to Sainsbury.

What legal chicanery, worthy of a Kafka novel! It leaves one wondering as to the motives of those who decided that this case had to be brought to court, not as one of simple damage to property, which it was, but as one which, we must presume, involved a spurious charge of giving offence to Muslims even though only race was mentioned in the indictment, not religion, let alone Islam. Could it be that the learned minds that shape and administrate our laws had yet again fallen for the oldest trick in the Sharia book, and been duped into believing, or at least into pretending to believe, that a protean Islam, when it suits its purpose, can be simultaneously a race, a religion and, it seems, even a chicken? But if it can metamorphose itself thus, which race had it in this case become? A racially motivated act has to be directed at a person or persons belonging to a specific race, not at an idea or belief system, such as Islam is. Otherwise, how can it be racist? So again, we must ask, which race was pejoratively targeted by the wording on the stickers? Edwards was found guilty of both charges, ordered to pay £160.00 in addition to the £16.50 to Sainsbury, *and given a one-month curfew from 9.00 PM to 7.00 AM...* just for fixing stickers on a few Sainsbury chickens. This verdict could set the precedent of making all protests against Halal ritual slaughter liable to prosecution under existing 'hate crime' laws, violations of which can carry a prison sentence of up to seven years.

In Australia, when snowflake Muslims claimed they were offended by the words 'Non-Halal Certificated' in an Adelaide butcher's shop window, the Advertising Standards Board ruled that it be removed, as it was 'demeaning to people of that faith [i.e., Islam] or are of Muslim ethnicity. [sic]' So once again, Islam is simultaneously a faith and a race. The traumatised Muslims claimed the sign, displayed, because customers were constantly asking if the shop's products were halal, 'poked fun of [sic] a specific group of people based on religious belief', thereby 'perpetrating a culture of vilification towards religious minorities'. Refusal to remove the sign, which poked fun at no-one, but simply provided information regarding some of the shop's products that had been requested by its customers, would result in a fine of \$20,000. However, there is no redress in law for those offended by the sight of butchers advertising halal, and neither should there be. Rather, it is ritual slaughter itself that should be outlawed, whether it be Jewish or Muslim..

Calling Halal ritual slaughter 'barbaric' was also one of the sins that in February 2019 got student Sebastian Walsh into hot theological water at the *dhimmi* University of Central Lancashire, along with expressing opposition in a class discussion to the Islamisation of Britain and free health care for non-UK citizens, views which, as he said, 'are held by many people in the public'. But not to be voiced and contested in a place of supposedly higher learning. Instead, like tale-telling school children... 'please Miss, Tommy said "bum"', infantilised adult snowflake snitches ran to Sir and had Walsh suspended and required to undergo 'diversity

training', which he refused to do. Finally, in yet another no less crazy case, in 2006, schoolgirl Codie Scott found herself in court on a charge of racist 'hate speech', when all she had done was to state a fact. Her crime consisted of saying she found it hard to communicate with Pakistani classmates engaged with her in a joint project because they didn't speak English. No doubt they also found it hard to communicate with her because she didn't speak Urdu. But something tells me that saying so would not be considered a crime. This happened, not in Pakistan, but England.

That such cases can come to court, let alone result in successful prosecutions, while Muslim rape gangs can go unpunished for decades, should be a cause for celebration by those who wish to silence all criticism of Islam, and likewise be seen by the same zealots as confirmation that the UK's formidable and ever-expanding battery of hate crime laws is achieving its objective. Yet when it comes to combating 'Islamophobia', some people are never satisfied, one being the former Labour Party leader Ed Miliband. With Muslim votes possibly holding the balance in what all believed at the time would be a close-run General Election, in an interview with Ahmed Versi, editor of the *Muslim News*, he promised that if elected, a Labour Government would 'change the law on this [Islamophobia] so we make absolutely clear our abhorrence of hate crime and Islamophobia. It will be the first time that police will record Islamophobic attacks right across the country'. (This proposal was subsequently adopted by Tory Prime Minister Cameron, who, in October 2015, announced the introduction of a national police register of convicted Islamophobes akin to the sex offenders' register.)

Nowhere in the interview did Miliband explain what he meant by 'hate crime' and 'Islamophobia', or what constituted an 'Islamophobic attack'. If by 'attack' Miliband meant grievous bodily harm, actual bodily harm and common assault (which includes threats of violence as well as actual violence) against persons who just happened to be Muslims, or deliberate damage to property belonging to such, then no new laws were required. Therefore he seemed to be implying that such attacks should be deemed 'Islamophobic' if they were deliberately directed against a person or persons not only known by the attacker to be Muslims, but *because* they were Muslims, thus being 'religiously (not racially) motivated. There is indeed a case to be made for such a law. A pogrom of Jews for example is just such a crime. But he did not say this. So, one is left to draw the conclusion, one supported by what he did say, that his 'attack' applied to actions that were not physical assaults or threats of such, but the expression of ideas and opinions, conveyed either verbally, or in written, printed, electronic and pictorial form, that can be construed as evidence of 'Islamophobia', resulting in those responsible being liable to criminal prosecution and entered on a register of convicted Islamophobes.

Given that this was his intention, much therefore hinged on the meaning of the term 'Islamophobia'. The Runnymede Trust first introduced the word in 1991, ten years before 9/11, defining it as an 'unfounded hostility towards Muslims, and therefore fear or dislike of most Muslims.' Who decides what is 'unfounded'? The use of this word also carries with it the implication that there can be 'hostility' towards and 'fear or dislike' of Muslims for reasons that are not 'unfounded'. And, as this definition pertains not to a belief system, Islam, but to those who believe in it, Muslims, actual people, why not 'Muslimphobia'? And why not 'Christianphobia' for those who in various ways display less than the required respect for Christians? No such word exists, and I am confident it never will. The on-line Oxford Dictionary offers the following definition of Islamophobia: 'Dislike

[of] or prejudice against Islam or Muslims, especially as a political force'. Here, Islam *is* included together with Muslims, with all manner of implications, not least legal. But adding to the confusion, the same Oxford dictionary elsewhere defines 'phobia' as an 'extreme or irrational fear or aversion to something'. So what happened to 'irrational fear' in its definition of 'Islamophobia'? The definition is also, from the standpoint of free speech, dangerous in the extreme, since, as is the case in Canada and several European countries, 'Islamophobia' is classified as a 'hate crime'. If we take the Oxford dictionary definition, this can mean that simply advertising one's 'dislike' of the *Koran's* advocacy of marital rape or wife-beating, can be a crime. And if we use the same dictionary's definition of a phobia, fearing (irrationally or otherwise) or disliking a person or group of persons as defined by their religion does not necessarily mean that they will be treated prejudicially. First, there has to be the opportunity to do so. And even then, it may well not happen, because, in and of themselves, fearing and/or disliking someone, or a group of people, is a feeling, not an action. How then can it be a crime? The phrase, 'especially as a political force' adds nothing to the definition, and in fact confuses the issue further, since Muslims, who though, like members of all other faiths, hold a wide variety of political opinions, define themselves only by their religion, as would Miliband's proposed new law or laws.

Demos, the cross-party 'Think Tank', while avoiding the usual reference to anti-Muslim prejudice, still contrives to get the meaning wrong, defining Islamophobia not as fear, irrational or otherwise, but as the propagation of 'anti-Islamic ideas'. In what sense is the propagation of an idea a 'phobia'? To use the same example, is a (traditional) feminist who advertises her (negative) feelings about the *Koran's* sanctioning of wife-beating and marital rape an Islamophobe? The first example of Islamophobia offered by Demos is a tweet that runs thus: 'Morocco deletes a whole section of the Koran from school curriculum as it's full of *jihad* incitement and violence the Religion of peace.' The first part of the quote is simply a statement of fact, and the second, what could be taken as an ironic comment on the first, an appropriate one, as many do call Islam 'the religion of peace'. And the *Koran* does indeed contain scores of Jihadi 'incitements to violence'. (See Appendix L). So where is the 'phobia'? What we have here is not fear, irrational or otherwise, but an attempt at satire. Now the second, also a tweet: 'I hate fucking Pakis'. Here we do have hatred, but not fear. And the hatred is explicitly directed against the people of a certain nation, not their religion. He did not say, 'I hate fucking Muslims (though he may well have done), but 'I hate fucking Pakis', as indeed do millions of (Hindu and Sikh) Indians and (Muslim) Bangladeshis. So how is this an example of Islamophobia? Is this the best that the combined brains of Demos can produce? Where Islam is concerned, the tank seems to have sprung a large leak.

Labour's post-Corbyn definition of Islamophobia is no better. In its *Code of Conduct* for party members, it says, correctly, that 'there is no single agreed definition of Islamophobia, albeit various civic, social, legal and political sources have attempted to define it.'. The *Code* then continues: 'One definition is the All-Party Parliamentary Groups on British Muslim's definition (APGBM) The APGBM defines Islamophobia as "rooted in racism [sic] and is a type of racism [sic] that targets expressions of Muslimism [?] or perceived Muslimness [?]. The Labour Party adopted the APGBM definition and its examples in 2019 [thus under Corbyn's leadership] as an important statement of principle and solidarity. The NEC reaffirms that position in this Code of Conduct.' The same *Code* also endorses the

Runnymede definition referred to above, which, says the *Code*, 'has identified Islamophobia as anti-Muslim racism', implying that Muslims constitute a *sui generis* race, an absurd proposition, because Muslims are to be found among every race on our planet.

What is common to all these definitions of Islamophobia, and any number of others I could have cited, is, firstly, that it is a version of, or akin to racism, and that no less crucially, the strong implication that there is something inherently reprehensible in advertising one's dislike of a faith that sanctifies wife beating, marital rape, decapitating and crucifying unbelievers, amputating limbs for petty crimes and killing apostates, to name what to an infidel such as myself, and no doubt millions of others, are just some of its more objectionable practices. As I have already asked, why is it that there are no equivalent terms applicable to a similar distaste for the tenets of other faiths, such as 'Christianphobia' or 'Hinduphobia'? But by now you should know the answer. My *Chambers* dictionary defines 'phobia' as 'a fear, aversion or hatred, especially a morbid or irrational one'. It therefore follows that in its literal sense, and in law, that is where matters should stay, the word 'Islamophobia' means an irrational fear or hatred of Islam. What possible grounds can there be to make it a criminal offence to fear (rationally or otherwise) or for that matter hate an *idea*? As far as the law and medical science are concerned, a phobia is not a crime but an abnormal medical condition, for example agoraphobia, a fear of crowded places. Fear that is not irrational, but well-founded, as I, again along with millions of other non-Muslims, believe fear of Islam is, is a perfectly natural and necessary human (and animal) instinct, one that has evolved through the mechanism of natural selection to protect life from danger. And who can honestly deny that of all the worlds' faith, because of the actions of many of its followers, Islam is the most to be feared? Fear that is irrational, deriving from the same source, the instinct for self-preservation, but unwarranted, is no less spontaneous, not wilful. No-one chooses to be afraid, rationally or otherwise, as distinct from choosing to be cautious when we are. Therefore, to attempt to banish or curb fear by punitive legislation is an act of sheer lunacy, especially when, in the case of Islam, it is indisputably well-grounded. So if the term is correctly construed, which it never is, to mean a not a hatred of Muslims, but an irrational fear (or hatred) of what they believe, we are therefore confronted by the absurdity of making it a crime to irrationally fear or hate a system of beliefs. And yet fear, or rather 'terror', of Islam is explicitly what the author of the *Koran* intended to arouse in non-believers, with the threat to 'cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve' (8:13) and 'strike terror into the hearts of the enemies of Allah'. (8: 60)

Did Miliband intend to make it a crime to react to these threats in exactly the way Allah intends? Why punish the terrorised and not the terrorist? Even if we substitute hate for fear, we still left with a law that seeks to criminalise hating, rationally or otherwise, an *idea*. As I have already asked, and I ask again, *if*, hypothetically, the intention is to make hating Islam illegal, then why is the same legal protection not being extended to all other doctrines, be they religious or secular? Why not 'Quakerphobia', 'Naziphobia', 'Toryphobia' and 'anarchophobia'? Using the law to stop people hating an idea is as insane as compelling people to love a piece of music, since, like a number of human emotions, hate is a spontaneous feeling. One cannot choose to hate or not hate any more than one can to love or not love. But certain manifestations of hate, specifically threats of or actual bodily violence against the object of the hate, are rightly actionable under existing laws. If

by 'Islam' in the word 'Islamophobia' is meant Muslim, as its false usage implies, then the term should be changed so that it not only, at least for some, implies, but actually says, Muslimophobia. Now, with this newly minted term, we can start afresh, and see where the proposed new law might take us.

Unlike Islamophobia, Muslimophobia *does* mean an irrational fear or hatred of Muslims. So, we ask again, as this is a medical condition (for why else the term 'phobia'?), should this be a crime? However, deliberately seeking to *cause* fear in Muslims by making verbal threats, as in the above citations from the *Koran*, or by gestures is, quite rightly, already a crime under UK law, 'common assault'. If the target of that fear has been chosen because of their specific characteristics, in this case not a race but a religion, there is a case to be made that this should add to the seriousness of the offence, and consequently, the severity of the punishment. However if it only applies to religion, it carries with one anomaly that I discuss below, and if doesn't, even more. (Some time after I made these observations, I was gratified to read that Maajid Nawaz of the reformist Quilliam Foundation largely agrees with me: 'To scrutinize and challenge an idea like religion that comes with so much power must surely be the right of every free-thinking individual and formed the very basis of Europe's Enlightenment. That is why the word "Islamophobia" is too blunt. It fails in principle to distinguish between hating Muslims and criticising Islamic doctrine.' To which I would add that hating Muslims *per se* should not be a crime either, but only acting upon it in ways that are themselves illegal, as specified above.)

Another case that could arise is the public advertising of fear or hatred for specific Muslim or group of Muslims, not because they are Muslims, but because of what they had done or said they intended to do. But this too is madness. We know that there are Muslims who definitely want to be feared, just as the *Koran* requires. Using the same terminology as Allah, unless we work for the BBC, we call them terrorists. Surely it is they who are breaking the law, not those who fear them. And some would argue that Muslims who carry out or approve of atrocities on the scale of 9/11, 7/7 or the Paris and Madrid massacres should expect to be hated, by peaceful Muslims no less than infidels. Is this the hypothetical offence, that of hating Muslim terrorists, the one that Miliband had in mind? Surely not.

In lieu of any specific indicators as to Miliband's legal proposals, by a process of elimination, we arrive at the only possible rational conclusion, that his intention must have been not to criminalise fear or even hatred of an idea, Islam, nor fear of Muslims, but only hatred of Muslims, and at that, only as Muslims, because one can surely be entitled to harbour and even express feelings of hatred towards a person or persons for what they have done, for example the gang rape of a child, irrespective of and as distinct from what the rapists claim they believe. Always assuming we can arrive at a satisfactory definition of what hate is (and this will have its difficulties for sure), there then arises the problem of defining its manifestations...verbal, visual, textual etc.

But by now, it should have become obvious that our projected crime of Muslim hatred, which by using the Greek prefix *miso* for hate, as in misogynist, should be designated *misomuslimia*, is already covered by laws relating to the incitement of religious hatred in general, which are so worded to ensure, despite the intentions and efforts of Tony Blair, that such laws do not protect religions, but only persons who believe in them. But even here, there are anomalies, which I referred to above. Why should it be illegal to 'incite hatred' against a person or persons on account

of their religion, but not their politics? Why should it be potentially illegal to say to or about a particular Muslim that I hate him (or her) for the way he or she insults and abuses Jews and gays, praises Hitler and denies the Holocaust, but it be within the law to say exactly the same to or about a secular Nazi? I also find it puzzling, to say the least, that it should be a crime under the Public Order Act of 1986, and the Act of 2006 amplifying it, to *incite* hatred of a person or persons on account of their racial, religious or other identity, but for it not to be a crime to express a hatred of the same person or persons if there is no proven intention to incite others to do the same...for example, a personal racial insult that only its recipient hears. I stand to be corrected, but I know of no other law which criminalises the urging of others to do something which is not itself against the law. A ruling by the US Supreme Court makes no such distinction. So-called 'hate speech', including inciting racial hatred, is protected as free speech by the First Amendment, whereas speech inciting acts of violence, so-called 'fighting words', are not so protected, because such acts are themselves unlawful. UK laws that criminalise the 'inciting' or 'stirring up' of this or that deplorable, but still legal belief - for example, that one race is superior or inferior to another (the *Koran* says exactly this about Jews, who are not human but 'apes and swine') - rest on the assumption, which I find demeaning and paternalistic, that perfectly decent people will, like sheep or robots, suddenly embrace obnoxious opinions about their fellow men and women simply because someone, who will almost certainly be a total stranger, and therefore not one whose opinion should be automatically trusted and acted upon, encourages them to do so with a few words or gestures. Where is the evidence that this is the case? And to compound the absurdity of such laws, they are redundant, because those who already hold these opinions will not need any 'inciting'. Public or on-line racial insults of an aggressive nature directed *at specific persons*, as occurred following England's defeat by Italy in a penalty shoot-out in the 2021 final of the European cup, as distinct from someone simply expressing a negative opinion about people of another race (such as 'all blacks are lazy', 'all Jews are mean', or 'all whites are racists') can and should be prosecuted as 'common assault', which, if racially motivated, as it was in the cases referred to, carries a maximum prison sentence of two years.

There are also other ways in which existing and projected so-called 'hate speech' laws have created or could create any number of absurdities and anomalies. Could it be a criminal offence, for example, to violate Sharia law by creating and then displaying images of Mohammed where they might be seen by Muslims? When organisers of a free speech event in the Dallas suburb of Garland did precisely that on May 3, 2015, their right to do so was protected by both the First Amendment and armed police, who shot dead two pro-ISIS Muslim gunmen who were intent on providing the world with yet another demonstration of Islam's 'proud tradition of tolerance' by attempting to re-enact the Paris *Charlie Hebdo* massacre of January 7, 2015. The reader is invited to contrast Miliband's thought crime proposals with the statement made by Garland Mayor Douglas Athas after the thwarted attack: 'There was concern, which is why we had heightened security in the area, but we all swear to uphold the Constitution: free speech, free assembly and in this case possibly free religion.' It is reasonable to assume that under Miliband's proposed new laws, if anyone had been brave enough to organise a similar event in the UK it would have been a question who got to them first, armed Muslim assassins, or police armed with arrest warrants.

Miliband's proposals were bad enough in themselves. But their vagueness was even worse, because they would have left the voting public in the dark, in the event of a Labour government being elected, as to what it would be have been possible to say without running the risk of ending up in court and possibly even in prison. All we were told was that Islamophobes were to be punished by toughening up and adding to laws that are currently on the statute book and have already led to a number of successful prosecutions. For example, given his declared intentions, it is reasonable to suppose that it could have become a criminal offence under Miliband's proposed anti-Islamophobia laws for a non-Muslim to say in public, or in print, something about Islam that is demonstrably true, such as the *Koran's* sanctioning of wife beating (Chapter 4, Verse 34) or the amputation of hands and feet for theft (Chapter 5, Verse 39) or that an adult male emulating, with a nine year old girl, Mohammed's consummation of his marriage to his last wife Aisha, as recorded in the relevant *Hadith* (e.g., Sahih Bukhari 4.1.1), would be liable to conviction as a paedophile under existing UK sexual offences laws. And as we have seen, saying just that led in Austria to prosecution and a conviction upheld on appeal by the European Court of Justice

A law which criminalises saying something that it is demonstrably true, and which does not endanger the security of the state or materially harm any individual, is manifestly and inherently an unjust law. Why then did Miliband propose to add more of the same to those we already have? Both the above statements are true, because there are Islamic texts to prove it, and they would also be endorsed as true by any honest Muslim cleric or scholar. But they would nevertheless run the risk, even under current thought crime laws, of being seen as Islamophobic not only by overly sensitive Muslims but also by zealous politically correct police. (See above) Supposing, as is plausible, that the proposed legislation had been so framed that these and other similar statements, all culled from authentic Islamic sources, would only have been actionable if made by non-Muslims, what then would have ensued would have been two sets of laws, one for Muslims, and another for the rest; in fact, the very Sharia law that many Muslims are currently demanding. This is not so absurd as it might sound. Such a law has been proposed in Canada and demanded at the United Nations by Doudou Diene, the UN's special rapporteur on 'racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance'. In 2007, in response to the drive by the OIC to criminalise Islamophobia, Diene proposed the adoption of a law binding on all UN member states that would define 'quoting from the *Koran* accurately but critically [sic] as an act of bigotry'. Such quotations 'needed to be proscribed'. Diene explained why:

One may note a number of Islamophobic statements have been falsely claimed to be scientific or scholarly in order to give intellectual clout to arguments that link Islam to violence and terrorism. [The very idea!] Furthermore, the manipulation [sic] and selective [sic] quoting of sacred texts, in particular the *Koran*, as a means to deceptively [sic] argue that these texts show the violent nature of Islam has become current practice.

If such a law, applicable only to non-Muslims, were to have been enacted in the UK, we would then have found ourselves in the humiliating situation of being the only country in the world that had repealed its blasphemy laws protecting Christianity only to have had them replaced with new blasphemy laws applicable

only to non-Muslims and protecting only Islam. If, on the other hand, such a law had been so framed as to have applied to everyone, then legislation designed ostensibly to protect the Islamic faith would have made it illegal for not only infidels, but for Muslims to cite certain passages from their own holy books. And we have seen already, in the case of the Taunton Preacher, a Muslim magistrate convicting a Christian whose offence consisted of reading out in public a passage from the Bible.

A novel, but also retrogressive, solution was proposed by a Labour MP, Keith Vaz, to ensure the protection of Islam from criticism. Vaz, a devout Roman Catholic, in March 1989 led a march of several thousand Muslims in his own constituency of Leicester to demand that Salman Rushdie's novel, *The Satanic Verses*, be banned. Consistent with his support for Sharia censorship, Vaz (a close friend of many years of Jeremy Corbyn), with Islam obviously in mind, advocated the re-introduction of the Blasphemy Laws, extended to cover all religions rather than just Christianity. Justifying what would constitute an unprecedented clamp down on free speech, he argued at an event convened by the Muslim Council of Britain on November 12, 2015, that 'religions are very special to people' and, we could add, especially so to the Muslim assassins who, the very next day, massacred 131 civilians in Paris to cries of God is Great. But so are other beliefs 'very special' if not to his Muslim friends, for example democracy, secularism, and the right to free speech, yet nobody in their right minds would propose that advocates of Muslim theocracy who criticise them should be subject to criminal proceedings. Those who believe in democracy and free speech are perfectly capable of defending their principles without the assistance of the police and the courts, or resorting to terrorist violence. So why not Muslims?

With a view to yet further tightening of laws that curtail what can be said about Islam, the Corbynised Labour Party and, belying their name, the Liberal Democrats, defined Islamophobia as 'a type of racism that targets expressions of Muslimism [sic] or perceived Muslimness [sic!]'. Since they were terms intended to be used in a court of law, what, precisely, were 'Muslimism' and 'Muslimness'? Did they mean a belief in Islam? If not, what did they mean? Even the police and Muslim clerics joined academics and secularists who protested to Home Secretary Sajid Javid that if enacted into law, this definition of Islamophobia, quite apart from inventing words whose meanings were not explained and yet again conflated race with religion, would create a blasphemy law drastically inhibiting criticism of Islam. By so doing, it would, contrary to the intentions of those proposing it, further fuel the already existing hostility towards a faith that is widely perceived as enjoying privileges neither demanded by nor afforded to any other.

It is not only in the United Nations and the UK that in the name of combating Islamophobia, serious proposals are being made to impose ever tighter restrictions on what can be legally said about Islam. While in the USA, to the palpable chagrin and frustrations of some on the left, free speech about religion is protected from such assaults on personal freedom by its First Amendment, to the north, in Canada, no such bulwark exists. There, in September 2015, Minister of Justice Stephanie Vallée brought before Quebec's National Assembly Bill 59, whose ostensible purpose was to criminalise the ubiquitous 'hate speech'. However, it became evident that something more specific was in mind when Jacques Fremont, Quebec's Human Rights (sic) Commissioner, revealed that if the Bill were to become law, he would use it to prosecute 'people who would write about the Islamic religion on a website

or a Facebook page'. Not criticise, but merely 'write about'! As in the UK with Miliband's proposals, under this law, offenders would be entered onto a hate speech offenders' register and being fined up to \$10,000 for 'writing about' Islam. Human Rights in Quebec were clearly in safe hands.

In the case of Miliband's proposed, though not defined, new laws, always assuming that they were intended to be implemented, and were not simply a ruse to attract the Muslim vote, only to be quietly laid to rest once the election was over, the proposed legal suppression of 'Islamophobia' would have required not only a wide extension of police powers, but the involvement of border agencies to prevent the importation of printed matter deemed 'Islamophobic', the surveillance and if necessary the blocking of the electronic transmission of offending texts and images such as is currently practised by China, North Korea and a number of Islamic regimes, and more police raids on newsagents, as well as on internet cafes, book shops and libraries, and possibly even private homes. Considerations such as these suggested that Miliband, in his eagerness to court the Muslim vote, either had simply not thought the matter through, or that he really believed that like the Sharia left and the rest of the political establishment, not offending Muslims outweighed the right to free speech and a free press.

But worst of all is that enacting legislation empowering the police to 'record Islamophobic attacks right across the country' would have encouraged offence-seeking Muslims, the politically correct and Sharia leftists to act as police informers. While no one in their private capacity as citizen would have been obliged to report to the police an Islamophobic offence, as the law stands, all public officials (whose numbers run into the millions) when acting in that capacity would have had such a duty, as defined by the Criminal Law Act of 1967. This would have created a thought control police on such a vast scale that a free discussion of Islam could only have been safely pursued in the privacy of one's own home. (As the saying goes, an Englishman's home is a castle. But not in Scotland, if the SNP's Muslim Cabinet Secretary for Justice, Humza Yusuf, had got his way. He excluded from his hate crime bill the clause that in the UK 1986 Public Order act, protected from prosecution 'behavior', 'words' or 'images' performed, uttered or displayed 'in a dwelling' (i.e., a private home) that would be actionable in public.)

Free speech and a free press were obviously not on Miliband's agenda, at least, not when he was being interviewed by the editor of the *Muslim News*. Had it occurred to him that if the beefed-up thought crime laws he was proposing had already been on the statute book, they would for sure have resulted in the prosecution of anyone in the UK re-printing, re-producing, offering for sale and even possibly just possessing a copy of the post-massacre edition of *Charlie Hebdo*? Perhaps Miliband had already forgotten that only three months previously, on the very day of the Paris massacre, he had declared to the House of Commons: 'We stand in solidarity with the people of France against this evil terrorist attack by people [sic] intent on attacking our democratic way of life and freedom of speech'. If we understand Miliband correctly (and that is not easy), the attack on *Charlie Hebdo* constituted 'an attack on freedom of speech', which indeed it most certainly was, though, as is standard procedure on such occasions, he did not say by whom or why. But if again we understand Miliband aright, his proposed anti-Islamophobia laws would have also necessitated an 'attack on free speech', outlawing the kind of images that led to the assassinations in Paris. These two positions cannot be reconciled. Trapped as he was between what he saw as the

necessity of appeasing incessant Muslim demands for the criminalisation of anything that smacked of criticism of Islam, and the need to reassure the broader public that he upheld 'our democratic way of life and freedom of speech', Miliband found himself defending principles that were totally and obviously incompatible.

The open-ended legislation proposed by Miliband was, at that point in time, the most extreme of a series of attempts by politicians to devise laws that would further curtail freedom of speech. However, flushed with his unexpected outright election victory on May 7, 2015, David Cameron, no longer constrained by his former Liberal Democrat coalition partners, announced his intention to crack down on 'extremism', by which term was meant the Islamic variety. The proposals he had in mind went far beyond even what had been implied by Miliband in his war on Islamophobia. Miliband wanted to change the law but remain within it. Cameron, incredibly and unambiguously, proposed to circumvent it: 'For far too long, we have been a passively tolerant society, saying to our citizens, as long as you obey the law, we will leave you alone.' So we should become aggressively intolerant...like some Muslims? This is the same Cameron who in the wake the *Charlie Hebdo* massacre proclaimed to the world from the steps of No. 10 Downing Street his belief in freedom of speech. Hitherto, freedom of expression had been increasingly curtailed by so-called 'hate crime' laws that have been approved by Parliament. Indefensible as they from a free speech standpoint, they were subject to debate and amendment, and in their final wording at least gave an indication of what could and could be said in public about certain matters, and afforded those so accused the right to defend themselves in a court of law. What Cameron proposed implied an intention, by methods not at the time specified, but that did not have the force of law, to augment the already existing legal constraints on free speech. That and that alone was the meaning of his warning that certain people are 'not to be left alone' even if they conform to the law. The reasonable assumption that the intended target of this extra-legal attack on what remains of freedom of speech was 'extremist' Muslims was totally irrelevant. Whoever they might prove to be, they had as much right to free speech as anyone else. Perhaps the time is approaching when those who value their right to free expression will be called upon to act in the spirit, if not strictly the letter, of Voltaire's axiom, 'I despise what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it', by defending even those who say, 'I despise what you say, and if I could, I would put you to death for saying it.'

If it was integration that Cameron was seeking, this was hardly the best way to go about it. How ironic that Cameron's proposed assault on the rule of law came only a matter of weeks before the 800th anniversary of the adoption of Magna Carta on June 15, 1215, subsequently condemned by Pope Innocent III as heretical for its placing secular limits on the power of god's anointed sovereign. Cameron's proposed measure violated one of the Charter's three articles which still remain on the statute book, number 39: 'No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgement of his equals or by the law of the land.' The proposed measures also violated what is regarded as the bedrock of all (western) law: '*Nullum crimen, nulla poena sin praevia lege poenali*'; No crime can be committed, or punishment inflicted, without a pre-existing criminal law. Cameron's threat became a reality with the proposal, following his election victory in May 2015, to enforce 'Extremist Disruption Orders' to silence Muslims deemed

'extremist', a term reminiscent of Apartheid South Africa's 'Banning Orders'. No longer would obeying the law of the land' be sufficient protection. The days of 'passive tolerance' were over.

Miliband, who as we have noted, is an atheist, would surely insist that his convictions, though entirely secular, are no less sincere and deeply held than those of a religious believer. So why then did he advocate legal protection for one, but not the other? On what grounds does UK law not treat all beliefs equally, as does the constitution of the USA? And if beliefs are not to be treated equally, as Miliband proposed, then it follows inescapably that neither are those who hold them. Even under current thought crime laws, a Muslim cannot be prosecuted for negative comments about socialism, but a socialist can end up court, and even in prison, just as he or she could in an Islamic country, for negative comments about Islam. So in effect, there are already two systems of law in operation, working to the advantage of Muslims and discriminating against infidels. Cameron's proposals did not remedy this situation, but simply complicated it further. It needs to be said that Miliband, possibly trying to over-compensate for his own lack of faith, had form on this issue, voting in 2006 for Christian zealot Tony Blair's failed attempt to introduce a law that would have criminalised 'insulting religion'. How is it possible to insult an idea? How can it be a criminal offence to insult either the ideas or, for that matter, the person of someone who died thirteen hundred years ago? Under UK law, (but not, as we have seen, Austrian) only the living can be libelled, defamed or slandered. An attempt to change this law was rejected in the House of Commons in 2012. Justice Minister Jonathon Djanogly ruled that 'a case for damage can only be brought by the person, no matter how revered, who has suffered the injury, loss or, in this case, damage to his or her reputation.' To provide for the protection of the reputation of the dead, in the case under our consideration, that of the prophet Mohammed, would therefore constitute one more concession by our legislators to Sharia law. Perhaps as a sign of times to come (Corbyn was elected Labour Leader four months later), at a Labour Party pre-election rally in Birmingham on May 2, 2015, the audience was segregated by gender, with a photo clearly showing women sitting to the left as they faced the platform, and men to the right. Yet previously, when the news first broke of university student meetings being similarly segregated by gender if addressed by Muslim speakers, the Labour Party had promised that if elected, it would ensure that this practice would be outlawed. Justifying Sharia gender segregation at its own meeting, a Labour Party spokesman ingenuously claimed that men and women were being treated as equals, because 'everyone was together in the same room'...as apartheid South Africa used to say, 'separate but equal', just as they were at the gender segregated university meetings the Labour Party promised to outlaw. So here we had the Labour Party abiding by Sharia law even before it was elected.

29 Lunacy

As we have already seen, zeal in assuaging what are assumed to be Muslim sensitivities can be carried so far that can they embarrass and, as in this case, bemuse those whom it is intended to protect. The following exercise in what might be described as multi-cultural astronomy was conducted at North Primary School in Southall, West London, an area of dense mixed Asian settlement. On the morning of Friday, March 20, 2015, pupils were eagerly looking forward to viewing a partial eclipse of the sun, due to take place at around 9.30 A.M. Then, at the very last moment, the school's Headmaster announced to the school that all children had to remain indoors. There would be no viewing of the eclipse after all. Puzzled and angry parents obviously wanted to know why. One, Phil Belman, was furious: 'My child went in having spent an hour preparing and making up her pinhole camera. This is an issue about science matters versus religion. I am outraged - is it going to be Darwin next?' Muslim parents were no less perplexed by the ban. One said, 'I am Muslim myself and my religion does not say we can't watch it'. Without wishing to be churlish, would he still allow his child to watch an eclipse if it did? A statement by the school Head, Ivor Johnstone confirmed that there were indeed religious reasons for the ban: 'The school made this decision when we became aware of religious and cultural concerns associated with observing an eclipse directly.' When asked by parents to provide more details as to the reasons for the ban, Johnstone explained that issues relating to 'confidentiality' prevented him from doing so. Again, one asks, could you make this up?

Perhaps Mr Belman had good reason to be concerned. Whatever Islam might have to say about eclipses, there are no doubts as to its attitude towards teaching the Holocaust and evolution. And we have seen that while it is not (yet) a criminal offence in the lands of the infidel to reproduce nature, fear of and actual violence by Muslims have on several occasions secured submission to the will of Allah. in this respect. The two most deplorable examples of such compliance occurred in of all places, Italy, the home of the Renaissance. When the Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Zayed bin Sultan al-Nahyan visited Florence in October 2015, possibly to save his blushes, but more likely to avoid jeopardising a trade deal, a cordon was placed around a nude statue by the US artist Jeff Koons. With more trade deals in the offing, following the ending of sanctions on Iran, identical steps were taken to enforce the Sharia when Iranian President Hassan Rouhani visited Rome in January 2016. Wine was removed from the menu at all official functions, and without it even being requested, all nude statues that his eyes might alight upon were covered with large white panels, giving a new twist to a venerable old saying: When Muslim potentates visit Rome, do as they do in Mecca. Outraged Italians denounced this concession to Sharia law as 'cultural suicide'.

There are, however concessions to Islam that by virtue of its history, culture and constitution, at least one country is unable to make, however much its leaders might wish to. When President Rouhani's tour of European capitals took him to Paris, he was invited to have lunch with President Hollande at an upmarket restaurant. No French meal is complete without a glass or two of wine, and this one was intended to be no exception. As a strict Muslim, the Iranian President felt obliged to decline the invitation unless wine was removed from the menu, and only halal meat served,

not just for himself, but for everyone. If he expected the same deference to Sharia law from his French hosts that he was accorded in Rome, he was rudely disabused. Rather than concede to his demands, Hollande cancelled the invitation. French officials later explained that an 'Iran (sic) friendly' meal violated French republican, in this instance, also secular principles. *Vive du Vin, Vive la France!*

Islam, as we seen in the cases we have cited, has proved time and again how, even when playing away from home so to speak, and consequently constrained by laws not of its own making, by adopting a pose of moderation and, with a little help from its friends, it has managed to secure for itself preferential treatment not accorded to any other religion in the Western world. However, on its home ground, Clegg's religion of 'love and peace' is not obliged to wear its deceptive mask of what passes for 'moderation'. There, Islam can reveal its true nature, to quote Tennyson, 'red in tooth and claw'. President Obama would have the world believe that 'Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance', so let us see how this plays out, so to speak, in the Islamic cesspit that goes by the name of Pakistan. This wretched and benighted apology for a nation has provided many obscene examples of how its Sunni Muslims prefer to conduct their dealings not only with other faiths but other versions of their own when they have the whip hand. Leaving aside instances of Christian church burnings and the butchering of non-Sunni Muslims, let us instead focus on another, again, largely unreported, example of how Islamic toleration goes about upholding its 'proud tradition'. Of all the many horrific cases where infidel individuals or single families, rather than buildings or congregations, have been targeted, among the worst must surely be the burning alive, in a village near Lahore on November 12, 2014, of a Christian couple falsely accused...as always...of desecrating a *Koran*. A 'call to murder' from the local mosque quickly rounded up a raging, eager mob of more than a thousand pious savages. The couple were seized, had their legs broken to prevent their escape and were then hurled into the flames of the kiln where they both worked as indentured labourers, little better than slaves. As the couple burned, the mob, now in a state of religious ecstasy, chanted 'Allah is great' and 'kill the infidel Christians'. Thus was Allah duly avenged. As is the way, no one was punished. And why should they have been? After all, burning a *Koran* is an act of blasphemy, and the punishment for blasphemy is death, with burning alive as one of its means

This is how the religion of peace, toleration and compassion conducts the charade of inter-faith dialogue in the UK's fellow Commonwealth member and supposed ally, Pakistan. Burning alive in Pakistan is not just a punishment reserved for non-Muslims. In the spring of 2016, two young Muslim women were burned alive by fellow villagers after running afoul of the local Islamic court, the *Jirga*. The first occurred in April in the village of Makol where, after a ruling by the court that she had violated her family's, that is, her male relatives' 'honour', with the approval of her mother she was locked in a Suzuki van which was then set alight. The second burning took place on May 31 in the village of Muree. A young female school teacher refused to marry the school's owner, so, again after a ruling by the *Jirga*, a mob, led by the jilted groom, burst into her home, beat up her up, dowsed her with petrol, threw her into a ditch and burned her alive. Such atrocities are routine affairs in the land specially created for the practise of the Religion of Peace. The reader will surely have learned by now that these outrages will not have been the occasion for protests outside the Pakistan High Commission in London by *dhimmi* feminists. Like the *Guardian's* Laurie Penny they would have paid no heed

to such 'horror stories' about the abuse of women in the realm of Allah, focusing instead on the battle at home, against the 'white male patriarchy', the glass ceiling and, of course, Islamophobia.

For all its barbarities, Pakistan is no match when compared with the Islamic State, which had its own way of conducting debates about the finer points of Islamic theology. The Caliphate's speciality was its staging of videoed mass executions, live burials, burnings alive, beheadings and crucifixions of fellow Muslims, Christians or indeed anyone who they deemed to be deviating in any way from the path of Allah. This carnage was of course nothing new in the blood-drenched history of Islam. What was novel was the use of infidel technology to enable the world to witness its latest phase on its computers and smart phone screens and, by so doing, win more admiring Muslim recruits, female as well as male, to its cause. One such production began with an ISIS road block forcing three trucks to stop. At gun point, the drivers were made to leave their cabs and sit down at the roadside. Suspected of being Alawite Shi'as, they were subjected to a theological quiz. The three truck drivers realised that they were doomed if they gave one 'wrong' answer. The questioning continued, still at gun point, until, inevitably, this happened. One of the drivers, asked how many times he should pray at a certain time of the day, gave the 'wrong' reply, even though there is nothing in the *Koran* about the rules for prayer, any more than is about the 'Five Pillars of Islam'. All three were duly condemned as 'polytheists' and shot. And ISIS is not Islamic? Another promotional video displayed a Christian on his knees, surrounded by armed masked Muslims. He was told if he converted to Islam, his life would be spared. Then followed the 'conversion', again dictated at gun point. Finally, a masked Muslim grabbed his head from the rear, and cut it off as per *Koran*, 'above the throat', with a long knife, to the obligatory wild cries of 'God is great'. This is how Allah's warriors conducted their dialogue with Christians in the ISIS Caliphate. And yet again, Christian clerics, with scarcely any exceptions, were silent.

In Kenya, it was the same. Following the success of their massacre, on September 21, 2013, of Christians at the Nairobi Westgate shopping complex, which left 67 dead and 175 wounded, on April 2, 2015, four al-Shabaab Jihadis believed they had booked their passage to paradise when, to the obligatory cries of 'God is Great', they staged an identical slaughter at the Kenya's University of Garissa, freeing Muslim students and then killing in cold blood 148 Christians and wounding another 79. And once again, in its wake politicians were reassuring us that just like all others, this atrocity had nothing to do with Islam. It could only have been by sheer chance that just Christians were murdered and all Muslims escaped unscathed. Yet again, media coverage was almost zero, unlike for the occasions in which an Israeli policeman is compelled to kill a single Palestinian terrorist to prevent him taking umpteen Jewish civilian lives

No one who understands the nature and workings of Islam would expect these atrocious crimes to be sincerely condemned by Islamic clerics in the UK or anywhere else. In the case of the Pakistan murders, they had been organised from a Mosque, and, as I have already said, desecrating the *Koran* is, after all, undeniably a capital offence. However, the UK being legally and by tradition, still a Christian country, one would have expected its Christian clergy to use all its many resources and ready access to the media to denounce the perpetrators of this and other similar atrocities against Christians. 26 Bishops (unelected of course) sit as of right in the House of Lords...the ideal tribunal, one would have thought, from which to

denounce the bestialities of Muslim Christian killers. But no. Like the Sharia left, where the atrocities of Islam are concerned, they prefer to hear nothing, see nothing...and say nothing. Their concerns are far closer to home, namely the preservation of their power, privileges and incomes. When almost daily headlines of atrocities compel clergy to address the problem of how to respond to the onslaught on Christians sweeping through the Islamic world and even beyond, as in Kenya, the best they can do is to offer prayers for its victims, praise their martyrdom and, in the words of Justin Welby, Archbishop of Canterbury, advise that 'Christians must resist without violence the persecution they suffer'. Not 'should, but, 'must'. Presumably, this injunction, supposedly being not a human law but that of God, applies in all such situations where the innocent are being persecuted and murdered by the guilty. This being so, Welby and the rest of his crew of clerical quislings, singing the praises of Christian martyrdom from the comfort of their high-security palaces and Cathedrals, would presumably have given the same advice to those Jews who, faced with certain death in the gas chambers of the Third Reich, sinned by rising against and killing their SS guards to escape from the Sobibor extermination camp in 1943.

The Christian clergy's response to the Islamic onslaught on their own faith is in all probability derived from the pacifist homily given by Jesus in Mathew: 'Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.' (6: 39) Has it never occurred to Christian clergy that even though they say Islam is a 'religion of peace', there is no Koranic instruction to the same effect? However, with the Bible being such an arbitrarily assembled concoction of myths, legends and doctrinal contradictions, it is only to be expected that also in Mathew, Chapter 10, Verse 34, we have the response that Jihadis out for the blood of Christians deserve but the West's gutless politicians and clergy refuse to give: 'Think not that I come to send peace on earth: I come not to send peace, but a sword.' Where is their sword?

Another feature of the Christian clergy's response to Islamic persecution is that in deference to Islamic sensitivities, just as with the UK Muslim rape gangs, the religious identity of the perpetrators of these killings is rarely if ever specified. After listing some of the countries where Christians were being killed by Muslims in their thousands for their faith, and offering prayers for their departed souls, neither Welby nor the Pope in their Easter Messages of 2015 dared mention the identity of their murderers. Not even after the slaying of a French Catholic priest at his altar could the Pope bring himself to even allude to the religion of his assassins, preferring instead to speak of his 'pain and horror' at an 'absurd murder' that had been motivated, not by religion, since 'all religions want peace' (especially the one whose Hamas Jihadis beheaded Jewish babies) but by 'interests, money, resources', though there was no evidence that the two assassins had raided the Church's collection box or purloined any of its artefacts.

The Pope made the mistake of assuming that the motives of Jihadis are the same as those of his own church, which for all its talk of spirituality, owe more to the 'interest' on its 'money' investments and preservation of its 'resources' than the Sermon on the Mount. And yet it was so obvious that the sole motivation of the killers was theological. Why else target a priest? The best the Pope could offer as an alternative explanation for the Jihadi onslaught on Europe was a tautology in the finest traditions of medieval scholasticism: 'The world is at war because it has lost peace'. He could just as easily have said, and to just as little effect, 'the world has

lost peace because it is at war.' These were the pearls of wisdom spoken by god's chosen representative on planet earth. Three days later, Pope Francis visited Auschwitz, where he wrote in the visitors book a plea for god to 'forgive so much cruelty'...that is, to forgive his fellow Catholic Hitler for murdering six million Jews, who his church, not so long ago, called the accursed of god for (allegedly) killing Jesus.

Forgiveness can only justly be given by those who have been wronged. I am not aware of any survivor of the Holocaust, or anyone who lost loved ones in the gas chambers of the Third Reich, who has forgiven the Nazis for committing the greatest crime in human history. So by what right had the Pope taken it upon himself to assume that role? Instead of asking his god to forgive Hitler and his accomplices (many of them also Catholics, including Himmler) for murdering six million Jews, the Pope would have been better advised to confess that he is the head of a church that far more any other institution was responsible in the first place for the creation and propagation of anti-Semitism, without which there could have been no Holocaust of the Jews; secondly for failing to publicly protest against the crimes Pius XII knew were being committed by the Nazis and, finally, spiriting away in their thousands to South America and the Middle East those who shared responsibility for them.

30 Exodus

In the light of humanity's indebtedness to them for their unparalleled contributions to human progress, if ever a people deserved a break after nearly two thousand years of persecution and worse, it was the Jews. And, until the rise of anti-Israeli Jihadism in the Middle East, it seemed that even if rather grudgingly, they were getting one. Much of the global reaction to the Gaza conflicts of 2014 and 2021, and the Hamas-Israel war of 2023, proved this assumption to be unduly optimistic. All over the world, public opinion researchers were finding firm evidence that the Jews were once again being depicted and seen in a totally negative light, and on a depressingly large scale. The talk was only of 'Israel's war crimes', not of the crimes committed against the Jews by enemies who sought their annihilation. And it was not only attitudes that were changing. After attacks by anti-Semitic mobs, European synagogues were being converted into barricaded fortresses. Some were also under 24-hour armed police and even army protection. Some politicians, instead of showing a little civic courage by denouncing those responsible for these extraordinary measures, found it easier to blame the Jews whom, they claimed, had invited such attacks by their supposed sympathies for Israel, while there was understanding and approval for terrorist, anti-Semitic Hamas and Hezbollah and even ISIS.

Who would have believed, on the eve of the outbreak of the Gaza conflict in the summer of 2014, that within months Jews, secular as well as religious, would be quitting Europe in droves to settle in Israel where, in the light of such threats and attacks, they felt, even if, as it proved, mistakenly, they would be more secure? 7,000 French Jews made this decision in 2014 and 10,000 more were expected to migrate in 2015. By the end of 2018, the total leaving since 2000 had reached 55,000. Who too would have believed that in the wake of the Paris massacres of January 7-8, 2015, the French army would be mobilised on a scale not seen since the Second World War to protect Jewish schools and synagogues from attacks by anti-Semitic Muslims? And this was just France.

Why did Jews who for decades had felt secure and settled in their European diaspora suddenly feel isolated and vulnerable? The gentile generations around them that could remember the Holocaust and the trials of those that perpetrated it were either growing old like myself or dying out, taking with them the memory, and the compassion that it engendered, of the unparalleled sufferings of the European Jews under Nazi rule. Today, in politics and the media, and among the public as whole, we have generations for whom the Holocaust is at best one dimly remembered topic amongst many on a school history syllabus, (unless, as has been the case both in the UK and on the continent, it has been removed after complaints by Muslim parents) or possibly a theme in a film or televised documentary. And as we have seen, for others, usually but not always Muslims, it is an event, exaggerated, invented or even facilitated by Jews and certainly exploited by them to win support for the aims of Zionism. Even Angela Rayner, some two years before being elected Deputy Leader of the post Corbyn Labour, had advertised her agreement with this slander. Far more vivid in the public mind than the Holocaust are today's images and reports of what many genuinely believe to be Israel's war crimes against the Palestinians. So much so, that for many, and as we have seen,

surveys bear this out, the words Holocaust and genocide now no longer describe what the Nazis did to the Jews, but with increasing frequency, as it did for former Labour Leader Corbyn and his cultic followers, what the Jews are allegedly doing to the Palestinians. It is not too hard to understand what is feeding this obscene animus against the Jews. For centuries, lacking a country of their own, and until the French Revolution heralded their emancipation, also denied equality under the laws of their hosts, the Jews could be and were persecuted, insulted, plundered, slandered and even killed with impunity. The Jews were always seen as fair game, an alien people who dared not and could not fight back as others did when suffering similar injustices. With the birth of the state of Israel in 1948, all that changed. Now Jews, if they chose to live in Israel, could enjoy at last the freedoms and security that the world had denied them for so long, and then as a final infamy, had either perpetrated, facilitated or passively witnessed, and in some cases subsequently denied, justified and even celebrated the Nazi Holocaust.

As Israel, from the first day of its existence, came under attack from its Arab neighbours, the world saw the emergence of a new kind of Jew, despised no less than the old, but for opposite reasons. The diaspora Jew had been scorned for his alleged cowardice, who went like a lamb to the Holocaust slaughter, a passive, submissive, almost willing victim of genocide, a lie readily believed by those who know nothing of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising of 1943, when its Jews took on the might of the SS and German army, the mass rebellion and escape from the Sobibor death camp later the same year, and the uprising, again in 1943, at the Treblinka death camp. It was then that Israel was born, in the face of what must seemed hopeless odds, when not only the Poles, their minds poisoned by centuries of Roman Catholic anti-Semitism, but also the British, more concerned about appeasing anti-Semitic Arabs than helping Jews escape the Holocaust, not only watched and did nothing, but even worse. (See Addendum to Appendix A)

The Israeli Jew is pilloried today because, having learned the lesson from the Holocaust that he is essentially on his own, he is ready and able to defend himself from his genocidal enemies. He can and does fight back, because at last he has a country that provides him with the means and the will to do so. That is the purpose and the meaning of Zionism, that the Jews should have a state like any other, with rights and obligations like any other. Anyone who says they are not anti-Semitic, but only anti-Zionist, as so many on the Left now do, is also saying that alone among all the peoples of the world, the Jews have no right to a homeland of their own, one in which they have lived for more than three millennia. The waves of anti-Semitism sweeping through the world today show that for the most part, humanity is not ready to grant this perfectly reasonable request. It is as if the Jews, once persecuted because of their perceived 'otherness', are now, as Israelis, to be condemned for wanting to be like everyone else.

Down the ages, anti-Semitism has been the fool's gold of those who believe that all their own, and maybe even the world's problems, can be solved by persecuting or even eliminating entirely those who they believe are their cause - the Jews. Incredibly, in the third decade of the twenty first century, there are millions who still cling to this delusion. Bebel's 'socialism of fools', despite its utter failure throughout history to bring any lasting benefits to those who have succumbed to its seductions, still casts its spell. Even the annihilation of Nazi Germany, followed by the repeated failures of vastly larger Arab armies than Israel's, and now Jihadi terrorism, to 'wipe off the map' the Jewish state, and complete Hitler's 'final

solution of the Jewish question' seems not to have convinced millions of Muslims that anti-Semitism sooner or later leads to the defeat and humiliation of those who embrace and practice it.

With Jews having quit Europe for Israel in their tens of thousands, we are witnessing the most shameful moment in the West's history since Allied politicians refused to lift a finger to save the Jews from the Nazi Holocaust. Then, deferring to the anti-Semitism of both Christians and Muslims, world leaders denied refuge all but a handful of those fleeing the Nazi terror, with the British blocking their passage to what was to become Israel, at the same time as government officials dismissed as 'horror stories' (again) and 'sob stuff' put about by 'wailing Jews' a series of authenticated reports of the death agony of European Jewry. Justifying this policy, one designed to appease the anti-Semitism of Arab leaders in the British Mandate, Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden argued 'it would be more merciful [sic] to turn these ships back', which elicited the comment from his private Secretary Oliver Harvey that 'unfortunately A.E. is unmovable on the subject of Palestine. He loves Arabs and hates Jews.'

More than two years after it had begun, the first British press report of the true scale of the Holocaust appeared, tucked away in the bottom left hand corner of the front page of *The People* of October 17, 1943. Its sixty words, titled *Hitler Murdered Three Million Jews in Europe*, were allocated less space than an advertisement for the cleaner Mirro on the same page. Though within range of Allied bombers based in Italy, Allied politicians and military officials repeatedly rejected desperate pleas by Jewish leaders and organisations to bomb the infrastructure of Hitler's extermination industry on the grounds that it would be a diversion of resources from the war effort, even though Auschwitz supplied Jewish slave labour for a nearby Krupp armaments factory, an AEG electricity generating plant and a vast IG Farben synthetic rubber complex, each of which were bombed.

Today, a second, but this time unimpeded exodus is underway, as tens of thousands of Jews quit a Europe whose politicians have done next to nothing to protect them from in some cases, the lethal consequences of Neo-Nazi and Islamic anti-Semitism, while the Corbyns added more fuel to the fire from the left with their lying, obsessional campaigning against the state of Israel. 24-7, day after day, year after year, and now decade after decade, it has been Israel, Israel, Israel and only Israel. No other state in the world, whatever it has done in the past or does now, is subjected to the same scrutiny, or attracts remotely the same degree of venom as Israel. No other government, no matter how many crimes it commits, is compared with that of Nazi Germany, only Israel's. Today there is no Nazi China because of its totalitarian regime, oppression of Tibet and persecution of its Muslims, just as there was no Nazi Iraq in 2003, when leftists and Muslims took to the streets in their thousands to oppose the removal from power of the one regime that more than any other, deserved such a comparison, that of the genocidist Saddam Hussein. (See Appendix XIV)

No state or political movement, of whatever complexion, demands that any country other than Israel should cease to exist, not even those that have come into existence by the near-extinction of their native populations, such as was the case with all the New World states and those of Australia and New Zealand. For all the mindless anti-Americanism that has prevailed over decades, nobody, not even the far left, demands that the United States should be 'wiped off the map' because it once (like Islam) practised slavery, and to this day is criticised, despite its twice

electing a black President, for its alleged 'systemic' racism, or before it was abolished, demanded that because of its system of apartheid, South Africa had no right to exist. Yet Naomi Wimborne-Idrissi of the quisling 'Jewish Voice for Labour' (in effect, for Corbyn) argued, without being able to explain why, that 'to set up a Jewish state for Jews' is 'racist', a 'colonial enterprise', a judgment shared by amongst others close to Labour's former Leader, Ken Livingstone and John McDonnell. There are three principal objections to be made to this oft-repeated assertion. First, Israel has no colonies. True, it 'occupies' the West Bank in certain respects, those to do with its internal security, but even the Palestinian Authority has never claimed that this 'occupation' is in any sense 'colonial', or a prelude to Israel converting the West bank into a fully-fledged Israeli colony. Secondly, if the reference to a 'colonial enterprise' is intended to imply that Israel itself is a colony, then of what power is it one? A colony belongs to the state that has acquired it. To what state does or did Israel belong? Perhaps the implication is that Israel is in deed if not word, a colony of the USA, its loyal outpost planted in the very heart of the Arab and Muslim worlds.

More frequently, Israel is cast in the role of a colonial power in its own right, with its invading Jews conquering and then subjecting to their rule the indigenous Palestinians. The problem here is that the Jews, not the Arabs, are the oldest recorded occupants of what is now Israel plus the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, having arrived and settled there in the early Iron Age no later than BC 1,200. Far from being colonisers, the Jews were themselves colonised, first, by the Babylonians in BC 586. (The so-called 'exile, when some Jews, no-one knows how many, were transported to what is now modern Iraq.) There then followed a second conquest, this time by the Persians, from 538 to 332 BC, a third by the Greeks, from 332 to 64 BC, who were in turn displaced first by Rome, from 64 BC to AD 324, and then Rome by Byzantium from AD 324 to 638. Thus far then, five conquests, not by, but of, the Jews. Enter Islam, which first, under a succession of Caliphs and then, beginning in 517, the Ottomans, ruled what is now understood as the 'Middle East' to the end of the First World War. It then, following a decision of the League of Nations, came under the administration, but not 'ownership', of the British Mandate, which lapsed when in 1947, the UN voted to create a Jewish and a Palestinian state on its territory Israel being awarded a territory in which Jews constituted a clear majority. In what sense, then, has Israel been, or is now, a colonial power? Neither legally nor *de facto* does it claim or 'own' territory beyond its internationally recognised borders, though there are rightist Zionists who demand that it should. Finally, no-one on the left objects to the Australians having an Australian state, despite its undeniable origins, unlike Israel's, as a 'colonial enterprise' of the British empire, and racist policies in the past towards its original inhabitants far worse than any that have been attributed to Israel in its dealings with the Palestinians.

Of all the world's 193 states, scores of them guilty of human rights abuses immeasurably worse than any committed by Israel, only that of the Jews is repeatedly and nearly always falsely accused by these very same states with crimes that they themselves commit as a matter of routine. There are currently around 170 territorial disputes in the world, but the media only takes an interest in the one that uniquely does not involve two sovereign states, and where the territories in question do not belong to anyone. There is no BDS for any of the countries that rule the 17 'Non-Self-Governing Territories' listed by the United Nations. There is no BDS

for Russia, which, under Putin not only occupied but illegally annexed Ukraine's Donbas and Crimea. But there is one, the only one, for a country that because it does not claim sovereignty over the West Bank, is not on that list of 170 territorial disputes. While Black Lives Matter, and politicians and academics who endorse its policies, demand restitution and even privileges for wrongs committed in centuries past, the Jewish response to a genocide committed in living memory is denounced as a 'colonial enterprise'.

Nobody, not even the Jews, argues that Germany should not exist on account of the Holocaust, or Turkey because of its Islamic genocide of the Christian Armenians, or Russia because of Stalin's deportation of a dozen or more minorities during the Second World War, the slaughter of Chechen and Afghan Muslims and Putin's ethnic cleansings in South Ossetia, or Serbia on account of its ethnic cleansing of Bosnian and Kosovo Muslims (denied incidentally by Corbyn in the House of Commons) and Croatian Roman Catholics, or questions the legitimacy of the more than a score of states in Africa and the Middle East conjured into existence by boundaries arbitrarily drawn on a map by western colonial powers. Yet Israel's right to exist is put in question, or even denied, in some cases by these self-same states. 36 states have no diplomatic relations with Israel, a state whose origins go back more than three thousand years, compared to Kosovo, which separated itself from Serbia in 2008, which has no diplomatic relations with only six. Of all the world's 193 states, only one, it seems, has a 'lobby' promoting its interests, interests that are invariably sinister and subversive. All the others have embassies and ambassadors pursuing goals that are routine and legitimate. There is no German lobby, no French lobby, British lobby, no Arab or Islamic lobbies, not even a US lobby, only embassies and ambassadors. But, as both the far left and the extreme right agree, there is a Zionist lobby, or cabal, pulling its invisible strings as only Jews know how.

No one accuses the millions of descendants of Irish migrants scattered around the world of disloyalty to their host country when they celebrate St Patrick's Day or, in the time of the 'troubles', supported, sometimes quite actively, the violent Republican campaign to evict the British from the Six Counties, and in the USA, lobbied politicians to the same end. And when Muslims from all over the world who, unlike the Irish diaspora's links with Ireland, have in most cases no connection whatsoever with Palestinians except a shared religion (and not all Palestinians are Muslims), place their loyalty to the anti-Zionist cause above any to the country of their domicile, this is also regarded, and not just by Muslims, as perfectly understandable, and by the Sharia left as laudable. Certainly, there is no talk of a 'world Islamic conspiracy', even though Islam's aim, despite its being described by the gullible and the mendacious, as a religion of peace, is indeed avowedly world conquest. But in the case of diaspora Jews, and despite their far from uniform attitude to Israel, here as in so many other respects, different rules apply, ones that never seem to work in their favour, so deeply is Jew-hatred woven into the fabric of Islamic and western cultures. There was a time when all Jews were, according to Christian teaching derived from (in places, contradictory) Biblical accounts of the crucifixion, judged to be collectively guilty for the death of Jesus, a guilt that could only be purged, and the persecutions that accompanied it ended, by conversion to Christianity. Herein lies the original source of all western anti-Semitism, including that of the largely atheist Sharia left, even if the guilt of the Jews has now in the West largely assumed a secular guise in the form of Zionism. For once again Jews

are being indiscriminately accused of not one but two crimes, this time, either of a mythical genocide of the Palestinians, or one of imposing on them a system of apartheid and even, as with Corbyn, of both. And once again, this sin can only be purged, and the targeting, harassment and even murder that accompanies it ended, by a conversion, not this time from Judaism to Christianity, as in days of yore, but to anti-Zionism, to an acceptance that of all the peoples of the world, only the Jews have no right to nationhood. The theologically rooted anti-Semitic prejudice and discrimination which was once the lot of the diaspora Jew, and which always contained and often exhibited the potential for something far worse, has mutated into an anti-Zionism that criminalises not only the Jews of Israel, but, through 'guilt by Semitic association', Jews everywhere.

Bubbling up from the sewers, onto our streets and now permeating and polluting much of the organised left, as demonstrated by its in many cases, despicable reaction to the Israeli-Hamas war of 2023, the plague is once again amongst us, and spreading fast, especially in circles that were once supposedly immune to infection. The Islamic war against the Jews, and the endorsement it has received in the West, has forged a new anti-semitic popular front. In this war against Israel - for it is a war – Stalinists, feminists, gay liberationists, academics, Greens, liberals, self-proclaimed anti-fascists, *soi-disant* followers of four Jewish atheists, Marx, Luxemburg, Trotsky and Lenin (yes, Lenin was, by Judaic law, from his mother's family, a Jew) have, as I show in this work, combined their forces with those of avowed Nazis and Jew-hating, misogynistic, homophobic, arch-reactionary Muslims, all united, whether they admit or not, by a common loathing, not just for Israel and Zionism, but for Jews, all Jews.

Addenda

In this work, I refer to a proposal made at the United Nations to criminalise the citing of certain Islamic texts by non-Muslims. In October 2018, the European Court of Human Rights (sic) made a ruling that in effect did just that. In 2011, an Austrian court convicted a woman academic, identified only as E.S., of 'disparaging religious doctrines' for saying in two public seminars in 2009 that Mohammed's last marriage to Aisha when she was six, and consummating the marriage when she was nine, was akin to paedophilia. The Court of Human Rights did not contest the truthfulness of the evidence on which her comments were based, which were derived from universally accepted Islamic sources, but instead chose to uphold the Austrian court's judgment after it has 'carefully balanced her right of freedom of expression with the right of others to have their religious feelings protected.' What this ruling means is that saying something about Islam which is factually true, when weighed against the alleged 'feelings' of Muslims, can constitute a criminal offence, and that based on the precedent of this judgment, all future appeals to the court concerning similar cases in any of the 47 countries subject to its jurisdiction could result in the same ruling. Germany went even further down the road of appeasing Islam when in December 2018 its Supreme Court upheld (*for Muslims only*) the legality of child marriage, those so registered totalling 1,475, of which 361 were to girls under the age of 13. However, Sharia law was first enforced in Germany as long ago as 2007, when a woman judge, Christa Datz-Winter, dismissed a divorce case brought by a Muslim wife on the grounds of wife-beating, (correctly) citing that it is sanctioned by Chapter 4, Verse 34 of the *Koran*

Jeremy and the Baby Killers

‘Gas the Jews’. Chant outside the Sydney Opera House, October, 9, 2023.

On March 28, 2001, Jeremy Corbyn voted against the bill proscribing Hamas as terrorist organisation. In March 2009, addressing a meeting at Westminster, Corbyn described this internationally banned terrorist movement as his ‘friends’, ‘dedicated to bringing about long term peace’ a movement which at that time, was already known to have been responsible over the previous ten or so years for the deaths of more than one thousand Israeli Jewish civilians.’ On the morning of October 7, 2023 Corbyn’s ‘friends’ launched their fifth and by far largest terrorist attack against Israel, firing 5,000 rockets into civilian areas, a war crime, as more than two thousand well-armed and trained Hamas fighters occupied settlements, shooting and burning alive men, women, children and babies, raping both living and dead women, beheading even babies, and kidnaping civilians, with 230 being deported to Gaza as hostages, also a war crime. Later that same day, the Manchester branch of Corbyn’s Palestine Solidarity Campaign described the massacre as a ‘heroic move’ carried out by ‘brave fighters’, by its Scottish counterpart as ‘absolutely amazing’, and by a London-based Muslim broadcaster with four million subscribers, Motaz Matar, as ‘a day filled with pride and glory.’

Also on October 7, at 11.43 AM, Corbyn confidante Elleanne Green, chief administrator and founder of the secret anti-Semitic Palestine Live website (see Appendix T) posted six images of Hamas invaders bursting into southern Israel, with the caption, ‘Gaza Broke the Siege.’ Yet again on the same day, at 2.30 PM, no doubt alerted to the Hamas pogrom in southern Israel, Corbyn’s Stop [sic] the War Coalition posted on its website the following announcement:

‘Emergency Demo: Stand With Palestine End Apartheid. Join us on Monday when we take to the streets to demand that Israel end its violent imposition of a system of occupation, apartheid and colonisation over the Palestinian people. When? October 9, 6 PM. Where? Israeli Embassy, W8 4QB.’

There was no ‘emergency’ concerning Israel’s ‘occupation, apartheid and colonisation over the Palestinian people’, all three being constant themes of Coalition anti-Zionist campaigning going back more than a decade. The real ‘emergency’, though for obvious reasons, the website could not say so, was the need to divert attention from the Hamas massacre of Jews still raging in southern Israel. What better way to do it than to announce a rally outside the embassy of the country whose civilians were being slaughtered, not because they were guilty of any of the alleged crimes listed above, but simply because they were Jews. And the stratagem continued to work to perfection, partly thanks to the mis-reporting, some of it of intentional, by the media. As a result, save for Jews, no one marched for Israel. But hundreds of thousands did for Corbyn’s ‘friends’, the baby-killers of Hamas. And far from all of them were Muslims. And this time, not over years, but in a matter of hours, the total number of Jews murdered by Corbyn’s ‘friends’ exceeded 1,400. It was also 15 times more than the 91 Jews killed by the Nazis

in the *Kristallnacht* pogrom of November 9-10, 1938. Seven days after the Hamas pogrom, on October 14, Corbyn himself spoke to a massive pro-Hamas rally in Central London. He accused, not Hamas, but Israel, of committing unspecified 'war crimes' and conducting 'an assault on the people of Gaza and the people of the West Bank.' There had been no 'assault' 'on the people of the West Bank', and no 'assault on the people of Gaza' either, but targeted air attacks on the Hamas military. But there had been a genocidal assault on the Jews of Israel, about which Corbyn said nothing. Instead, he continued: 'You must [sic] condemn what is happening now in Gaza by the Israeli army.' (Nothing was 'happening now in Gaza' because the Israeli army was not 'in Gaza'.) As on previous occasions, the rally's proceedings were accompanied by the Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions chant, 'From the river [Jordan] to the [Mediterranean] sea, Palestine shall be free.' On October 17, like most media, only without any of the usual reservations, Corbyn recycled fabricated Hamas claims that an Israeli missile had earlier that day killed around 500 patients and staff at the al Ahil hospital in Gazi City. Timed at 7.17 PM, Corbyn tweeted the following:

'Israel air strikes [note plural] have hit al Ahil hospital in Gaza. More than 500 people - patients, doctors and those sheltering - have been killed. What unspeakable horror. We will mourn their loss forever.'

What unspeakable, pogrom-inciting lies. There had been no 'Israeli air strikes'. An Islamic Jihad rocket aimed at Israeli civilians had misfired and landed in an adjacent car, killing not 'more than 500 but at the most, 50 Palestinians. (see below for details) Unlike most media, when, a matter of days later, the truth as to who was responsible for these death emerged, Corbyn did not retract his false account. These tragic as well as despicable events unfolded partly because, eight days previously, Netanyahu's coalition had been taken totally unawares by the Hamas onslaught. Dependent for its survival on ultra-orthodox fanatics, some of whom, only hours earlier, had been spitting on Christians and illegally enforcing gender segregation in public places, it had been entirely focused on conducting a vendetta against Israel's secularism and the independence of its legal institutions. Before the day was out, Israel had declared war on Hamas, and most of Israel's parties had announced their intention to form a national coalition for its duration, a war not against secularism, but Israel's real and only enemy, Jihadi Islam.

While Labour Leader Keir Starmer's response was immediate and totally supportive of Israel's right to defend itself from what was in effect an act of war, in view of her past vitriolic anti-Israeli statements, it should have been endorsed by Labour's Shadow Minister for Crime Reduction (sic), Naz Shah, because she, like other prominent Muslims, had accused Israeli Jews of deliberately killing Palestinian babies. Instead, there was silence, while in both the UK and across the world, her co-religionists took to the streets in support of the Hamas baby-killers. In Sydney, they were videoed chanting, as they did in 2014, 'gas the Jews'. In the UK, there was a *seven-fold* increase in anti-Semitic incidents, while in London, it was double that amount, with Jews having to hide their identity in public. In central London, Muslims waving Palestinian flags celebrated the Hamas pogrom, as did Corbyn's 'The World Transformed' at a rally in Liverpool, with a speech by a Muslim woman saluting Hamas martyrs who were heading for paradise, their now eternal erections at the ready. Also in London, on October 9, Corbyn's

Palestine Solidarity Campaign and Stop [sic] the War Coalition staged their 'emergency' pro-Hamas march and then rally outside the Israeli embassy, the embassy of a country that only a matters of hours previously, had lost more than one thousand of its citizens in a pogrom perpetrated by the movement these demonstrators were applauding. It is impossible to imagine anything more obscene. Anyone not appraised of the true situation in Israel would have quite reasonably assumed that this unprecedented global wave of hatred against the Jews, with identical such rallies from Ireland to Australia, was in response to unspeakable Israeli war crimes committed against the people of Gaza.

The *dhimmi* SWP's *Socialist Worker* was in a state of ecstasy at the ongoing pogrom in southern Israel, with its Orwellian 'Palestine fighters have launched resistance attacks [sic- how's that for a oxymoron?] on Israeli towns cities and settlements. And they have won huge [sic] military gains.' As for Hamas atrocities, 'the Palestinian people have the right to respond in any [sic!!!] way they choose to the violence that the Israeli state metes out to them every day.' But Gaza, from whence came the Hamas invaders, was not under Israeli rule, which ended in 2005, but that of Hamas, which began in 2006. And did 'any way they choose' include rape, massacring young Jewish men and women at a dance festival (see below) decapitating even babies, burning people alive, kidnaping civilians, including children, to be used, again, illegally, as hostages and human shields, and triumphantly parading the naked body of a murdered Jewess through the streets of Gaza city? We must assume from this unequivocal statement that it did. So what happened to the rules of war that Israel is always accused of violating when it responds, legally, under international law, to Hamas attacks?

On October 12, confronted with evidence of one of those choices, the *Socialist Worker*, like the far left generally, engaged in atrocity denial, with the claim that 'the media had lied about beheaded babies to justify Israeli [sic] war crimes'. Two days later, the *Jerusalem Post* confirmed that photos of this atrocity had been shown to US Secretary of State Antony Blinken during his visit to Israel on October 12 and that 'later in the day, the photos were published by the Prime Minister's office on Twitter.' Denial was not the monopoly of the far left. Muslim Birmingham City Liberal Democrat Councillor Ayoub Khan said he had a 'problem of credibility' with the accounts of the October 7 massacres. 'There is something called the big lie theory...it was used by the Nazis and others'...for example, those Muslims and far leftists who claimed that Israel, and not Islamic Jihad, fired the missile that landed in the car park of the Gaza City Hospital on October 17.

[A necessary interpolation. By way of a change, on October 17 and 18, the *Socialist Worker* engaged not in atrocity denial, but 'fake news', ironically, together nearly all 'capitalist' media, by reporting an Israeli atrocity that never happened. A rocket had landed on a car park close to the Al Ahli hospital in Gaza City on the evening of October 17, burning cars close to a small crater, but without removing leaves on nearby trees. In a matter of minutes, the Hamas lie machine went into overdrive, with the claim that Israel had killed at least 500 hospital patients and staff (if so, what were they doing in a car park?), thereby unleashing, as was for sure intended, massive anti-Israel demonstrations across the Arab world and beyond. In addition to Corbyn, that same day, *Socialist Worker* also accused Israel of having 'murdered at least 500 people at the al Ahil Baptist hospital', which was 'filled with the sick, the dying, the young and the old'. One would

have assumed from its detailed description of the scene in the hospital that the reporter had been an eye-witness to the tragedy and the sufferings of its victims, and had even been able calculate their approximate number. The reality was, of course, somewhat different. So we can safely assume that the *Socialist Worker* had no on the spot reporter in Gaza City, any more than did the BBC, its story, again like the BBC's, consisting of recycled Hamas propaganda.

When, the next day, western media, including the BBC, began to express doubts as to Israel culpability, again like Corbyn, the SWP stuck by its fabricated account. Without being able to provide an image of a bombed hospital, or any other evidence to substantiate its allegations, the *Socialist Worker* accused Israel of 'trying to pass the buck for its murder of 500 people.' When confronted with accumulating evidence from a wide variety of (non-Israeli) sources that the missile had been (mis) fired by Islamic Jihad, and the number of its victims could be as low as 15, without any explanation, the story went dead and was removed from its website. After October 18, there were no more claims by the *Socialist Worker* of an Israeli 'murder of 500 people'. Russia had been no less quick of the mark, with Deputy Head of the Russian Security Council, Dmitry Medvedev, describing the alleged Israeli missile attack as a 'monstrous war crime' for which 'the US is responsible', while Russian Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Maria Zakharova called it 'an act of dehumanisation', something her own government specialised in. Corbyn's Stop the War Coalition re-cycled the same lie: 'The Al Ahli hospital massacre is an atrocious war crime. [Correct] It is further proof [sic] of the barbarity of what is now an Israeli policy of ethnic cleansing.' Like the *Socialist Worker's*, this story was quickly cast into the far left's memory hole without any explanation, because 'proof', or at the very least, evidence, released by a number of intelligence agencies and published on YouTube, told a very different story. There, one could clearly see the trajectory of a rocket launched from near the hospital, itself a war crime, which then crashed moments later into the hospital car park, followed by a huge sheet of flame as its unused fuel ignited on impact, leaving a crater in the car park less than a metre deep - far too small to have been caused by an Israeli missile. Also on YouTube, an Islamic Jihad operative could be heard shortly after the explosion admitting that it had been caused by one of their rockets launched from Gaza City:

'I'm telling you this is the first time that we see a missile like this falling, and so that is why we [sic] are saying it belong to the Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

'What?

'They are saying it belongs to Palestinian Islamic Jihad.'

'It's from us?'

'It looks like it!'

'Who says this?'

'They are saying that the shrapnel from the missile is local shrapnel and not like Israeli shrapnel.'

'What are you saying?'

Shortly after the incident, a BBC reporter, speaking from the PA capital, Ramallah, 51 kilometres distant from Gaza City, and therefore not a witness to what occurred, said 'it is hard to see what else this could be, given the size of the explosion [which he never saw] other than an Israeli air strike or several [sic!] air strikes.' As every journalist should know, especially those employed by a

publicly funded news service such as the BBC's, the first duty of a reporter is to check and then double check the facts that underpin the story before going public. How come then that with this story, which impacted directly millions of people's lives and, like Corbyn's, could easily have put Jewish ones in jeopardy, this elementary procedure, as in other similar instances, was blatantly not followed? I will give the reader what I believe is the correct answer, based not just this one outrageous case, but others I have described in this work. Such pseudo reports are tailored to conform to a certain 'narrative', one that is deeply and consistently hostile not only to Israel, but to Jews as such. There is ample proof of this, and I am far from being the only one who has registered it.

Having jumped the gun by accepting the Hamas version of the incident, as had other prestigious media, for example, the *Guardian*, *New York Times*, CNN and even Reuters, the BBC desperately back-peddled the next day, after it became clear that the Hamas version was, at the very least, suspect. When the BBC consulted a number of experts on such events, something it should have done before making any comments or claims, in the light of all the available evidence, not one believed that the missile had been fired by Israel. On October 23, without explaining why, the *New York Times* admitted that it had 'relied too heavily on claims by Hamas, and did not make clear those claims could not be verified.' 'Too heavily'? It should not have relied upon them at all. ITV also had the decency, unlike the BBC, to apologise for its use of stories emanating from at the very least, dubious sources. One such was the London based Palestinian, Latifa Abouchakra, employed by the same Iranian channel that from 2009 to 2012, also employed the services, at the rate of £1,250.00 per hour, of Jeremy Corbyn, Press TV. Ms. Abouchakra had given an interview to ITV on the subject of Islamophobia, claiming she had been abused as a Muslim as a result of the Hamas-Israel war. It was not the subject, but the choice of Ms Abouchakra to interview about it, that was the issue. It later transpired that on Corbyn's former employer, Press TV, she had saluted the October 7 pogrom as, quote 'a homecoming': 'As fragile as a spider's web, the Zionist entity [Jihadpeak for Israel] is shaking with fear. In an early morning shock, Palestinian resistance [sic] factions from Gaza launched a three-pronged attack [thus, a 'resistance attack'] on the entity. What ensued was the homecoming [sic] of at least 1,000 Palestinians [all, more than likely born, in Gaza, more and certainly not in Israel]...over one hundred settlers [sic] have been taken as prisoners of war [not hostages] by the resistance - the vast majority are members of the occupation forces.' Another lie. Quite rightly, the Jewish Board of Deputies accused ITV News of 'a staggering failure of due diligence' in not checking Ms. Abouchakra's profile before inviting her to be interviewed. The question arises yet again - why does this keep happening only when the story has a Jewish dimension, and when the 'spin' always puts the Jews in a bad light?

Now to resume the main narrative.]

While, in the wake of the October 7 pogrom there were massive world-wide demonstration in support of the Hamas baby-killers, with many involving large numbers of non-Muslims (including Black Lives Matter) there were none on behalf of their victims involving similar numbers of non-Jews. On October 21, to chants of '*Jihad*', 150,000 Muslims and infidels marched in London against Israel. The next day, barely 10,000, nearly all Jews, attended a rally in Trafalgar Square to

demand, not death to the Palestinians, but the release of all the Jewish hostages held by Hamas. Once again, as so often in their past, at a time when they most needed the sympathy and solidarity of others, Jews found themselves virtually alone.

That millions across the world had taken to the streets to protest against the illegal (but unintentional) killing of one person, George Floyd, but, apart from Jews, scarcely anyone did so in protest against the preplanned ritual slaughter of 1,400 Israeli civilians, spoke volumes for the double standards of the anti-racist industry, just as did Corbyn's refusal to condemn the Hamas invasion of Israel for his highly selective peace campaigning. Here, yet again, we were witnesses to the so-called left's bogus version of solidarity. As on this occasion, it will mobilise in its hundreds of thousands on behalf of any number of causes, some spurious, others genuine; trans, gay, black, Muslim, anti-Zionist, women - unless they are victims of Muslim gang rape - and of course, against the Jews of Israel...but never for them.

Why this sudden welling up of a global, atavistic hatred of Jews, one that not only came from Muslims and neo Nazis, but now, as never before, from the left? It was because the atrocities committed by Hamas on Israeli Jews did not conform to and therefore sustain the prevailing 'narrative' of the Jews as the permanent oppressors of the Palestinians, just as the Nazis depicted them, even at the height of the Holocaust, as the eternal exploiters of all humanity. The false narrative of Jews as victims of Hamas had to be erased, blanked out, 1984 fashion, by a massive far leftist mobilisation, beginning the same day, against a people that had suffered its worst atrocity since the Holocaust, a global, staged-managed and orchestrated so-called 'punching up' that targeted the Jews as the real genocidists. Whatever it took, and with few exceptions, the left-inclined, so-called 'quality' media were only too willing to help, the prevailing agenda had to be reset. At all costs, because the fate of the anti-Zionist cause was at stake, the Jews had to be portrayed yet again as the guilty party. The opportunity came when an Islamic Jihad rocket landed in the car park of a Gaza City hospital.

The obsession with Jews being by their nature oppressors, the core belief of the Nazis from which all their crimes flowed, has in the past led, as we have seen, to a re-casting by the far left and Muslims of the history of the Holocaust, becoming, in the western version, one in which Zionists collaborated with the Nazis in the murder of non-Zionist Jews to further their goal of a Jewish state in the British Mandate; and in the Muslim and Arab version, instead of a Nazi Holocaust of the Jews, a Zionist one of the Palestinians. In the same spirit and with same objective, we have seen attempts by Corbyn and others of a like anti-Jewish disposition to abolish Holocaust Memorial Day, on the grounds that it was not a unique event, and replace it with a Genocide Memorial Day, one of whose genocides would be that of Israel's of the Palestinians. In October 2023, one could see unfolding on the streets and in the world's media, virtually unchallenged, a similar Orwellian exercise, one in which once again, truth became lies, and lies, the truth. This enduring and now heightened hostility towards the Jews was reflected in a number of international reactions to the Hamas onslaught on Israel. PA President Mahmoud Abbas, with whom Israel had to negotiate the so-called two state, said that 'Palestinians have the right to defend themselves'...by launching an all-out, genocidal war against Israel. Palestinians had the right to 'punch up' but not, it would seem, the Jews, even when they were the target of a pogrom. In a cynical

attempt to justify the massacre of October 7, UN General Secretary Antonio Guterres said it 'did not happen in a vacuum'. Indeed it did not. It 'happened' at a dance festival, in a kibbutz, and in people's homes.

Other international bodies, politicians, and a number of western media outlets, as on previous occasions when it had been the target of unprovoked Hamas attacks, called upon Israel to show 'restraint' and to ensure that its military response was 'proportionate'. 'Proportionate' to what exactly? Did this mean that Israel had to limit the size of its projected invasion force to the number of Hamas terrorists who participated the attack of October 7? No other country had been called upon to respond in this way when coming under a military attack. And no other country would have done so if it had been. So why should have Israel? If, in the Second World War, the Allies had complied with such a demand, then they would have lost it.

There were protests, mostly from prominent Jews, when the BBC defended its describing of Hamas terrorists as 'militants', which it had not done on previous occasions when the victims of a terrorist attack had not been Jews. Also typical of its supposedly neutral reportage was its comment that the intensity of the 'unprecedented' violence was due to the 'scale and ferocity of attacks on both [sic] sides'. Six of its Arab service journalists went further, tweeting that the Hamas attack on Israel had been 'a day of hope.' The *Guardian*, the printed version of the BBC, was no better. When it came to reporting the alleged Israeli missile strike on the Gaza City hospital on October 17, even after clear evidence had emerged that Hamas, or rather, Islamic Jihad, was the guilty party, the *Guardian* was still playing it down the middle, careful not to attribute the incident to either Israel or Hamas, but still endorsing the Hamas claim there had been 'hundreds of deaths of Palestinians in a blast at the Al Ahil hospital'. No sources were cited for this claim, or any evidence provided that supported it. The only images that had been seen of the effects of the 'blast' (and which *Guardian*, wisely, did not show, since they contradicted the supposed death toll) had been of a small crater in a car park, some burned cars, broken windows of an adjacent building, and trees that had not shed their leaves, despite the impact of a 'blast' being of a scale that the *Guardian* had said killed 'hundreds' of Palestinians.

If images had existed of a hospital sufficiently damaged to account for the death of 'hundreds' of its occupants, Hamas would have dispatched them around the world in a matter of minutes. Instead, all we were shown of the impact of the 'blast' was, to repeat, a car park with a shallow crater, some burned-out cars and trees with leaves. That there were no images of at least a partially demolished hospital should have rung alarm bells in the editorial offices of the BBC and the *Guardian*, as it should have in other media outlets that chose to accept the Hamas 'narrative' rather than wait for the evidence as to what really happened. It came on October 20, when the *Jerusalem Post* reported that a number of (non-Israeli) evaluations of the effect of the rocket blast estimated the number of fatalities to be in the region of 15, not 471, as claimed by Hamas, '500' by the SWP, or 'hundreds, as claimed by the *Guardian*. And they were killed in the car park, which would explain why there were no images of a bomb-damaged hospital.

Meanwhile, on the global scene, the UN's Security Council yet again failed to live up to its name, being unable to approve and act on a resolution condemning Hamas for its invasion of Israel because it was vetoed by Russia, just as it had the resolution condemning its invasion of Ukraine. For good measure, Putin accused

Israel of ‘turning Gaza into a concentration camp’, something that as a former KGB officer, Putin would have been familiar with, since Stalin did the same to his own country. UN Human Rights Council Special Rapporteur for the Palestine-Israel conflict, Francesca Albanese, followed Putin’s lead, accusing Israel of ‘militarised settler-colonial occupation’.

However, so far as individual (mainly western) countries were concerned, most reactions were supportive of Israel, even if not in every case explicitly endorsing its legal right to defend itself from an unprovoked invasion. One which did also happened to be the most commendable, that of Ukraine’s President Zelenskyy, whose country in its hours of desperate need had been treated shabbily not only by the likes of Corbyn, but by the Netanyahu administration and its centre-left predecessor. For fear of antagonising Putin, both had refused to afford any military assistance to Ukraine (ironically the very same policy advocated by the anti-Zionist Corbyn), confining themselves to voting for UN resolutions condemning Russia’s invasion and providing medical supplies. Typical of this stance was the lack of any condemnation when, a matter of days before the Hamas invasion, a Russian missile strike on a Ukrainian village left 52 civilians dead. With some justice then, Zelenskyy could have used Israel’s predicament as an opportunity to remind its politicians of how they had stood aside when his country came under a far more devastating attack. But he did not. This is what he did say: ‘Israel’s right to defence is indisputable. Terror is always a crime, not just against any one country or specific victims, but against humanity as a whole. The world must stand united, so that terror does not attempt to take or destroy life anywhere at any moment.’

The European Union, which for years, if not decades, had, unintentionally but knowingly, funded Palestinian terrorism, had initially announced that it would ‘immediately suspend’ all payments to the Palestinian Authority. But after protests by some member states, including Spain and Ireland, it no less immediately backtracked. Germany, to its credit, did cease all funding to the Authority. Like some members of the EU, there were others in the rest of the world who were not united in support of Israel, just as there had been those who had not supported Ukraine’s resistance to Putin’s invasion. Iran, supplier of drones to Putin and rockets to Hamas, was one of several countries that fitted both descriptions: ‘We kiss the hands of those who planned the attack on the Zionist regime’, said Corbyn’s former employer, Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei. Hamas Commander Mohammed Deif was specific as to the methods: ‘Whoever does not have a gun, let him bring out a knife, a cleaver, an axe. Carry out your attacks on the settlements [that is, Jewish civilians] with all the means and tools at your disposal.’ Yet according to Hamas spokesman Basem Naim, ‘We have not killed any civilians’. With the number of Jewish corpses discovered growing by the hour, many of them burned and mutilated, Hamas was providing incontestable confirmation of the description by their ‘friend’ Corbyn that it was a movement ‘dedicated to long term peace and social justice in the whole region’, a region which the Hamas invasion, like the BDS chant, had made all too clear, included the state of Israel.

Article Seven of the Hamas Covenant of 1988, (which, I was assured by a Corbyn cultist, had long ago been rescinded), cites the *hadith* (a saying of the prophet) which sanctioned the pogrom Hamas unleashed on October 7, 2023. Titled ‘The Slogan of the Islamic Resistance [sic] movement’, Article Seven says:

‘Allah’s apostle said, “The day of judgment will not come until Muslims fight the Jews, killing the Jews, when the Jew will hide behind stone and trees. The stones and trees will say, ‘O Muslims, O Abdullah, there is a Jew behind you, come and kill him.’” (Sahih al Bukhari 2926, Book 56, Hadith 139) As for decapitation, it is sanctioned, not by a *hadith*, but the *Koran*: ‘I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Smite them above the necks, and smite off all finger tips.(Chapter 8, Verse 12)

Motivated purely by theology, the Hamas invasion of Israel therefore had nothing to do with a so-called liberation of Palestine, all the more so with one part of it already being under Hamas rule,. Those supporting the invasion no less than those who carried it out must have known that once confronted with the vastly superior numbers and equipment of the Israeli military, within a matter of days, if not hours, they would either all be captured or, far more likely, as it proved, killed. Theirs was not a war of ‘liberation’, but a classic Jihadi suicide mission no different to 9/11, in this case, not to kill the maximum number of American civilians, but to unleash a pogrom, to murder as many Jewish civilians as possible before being dispatched, since it merits repeating, to paradise, eternal erections at the ready. Although he did not say so in his speech to the pro-Hamas rally of October 14, I am prepared to consider the possibility that Corbyn did not approve of ‘cutting above the necks’ of Jewish babies, unlike a goodly part of his Muslim audience, who were baying for more Jewish blood. And some might argue, how could he have done otherwise? They would point to the fact that even if all those present at the rally had been as aware as Corbyn that as many as 40 babies had been slaughtered, some in the sight of their parents before they too were dispatched, this would not have detracted from their support for Hamas, while Corbyn denouncing it as a war crime would have done no good for his reputation as an implacable enemy of Israel. And anyway, the purpose of the rally was not to condemn such and other war crimes, however abominable, but to salute and celebrate the movement that had committed them. This reality therefore required, so the argument might have gone, at the very least, Corbyn’s tacit acquiescence in the deed. And, as so often in his sordid, to put it as politely as one can, political career, whatever his motive, that is what they got.

Below is a young Israeli woman’s account of the religion of peace massacre at the Supera Nova dance music festival on the evening of October 7, the first day of the invasion. It was billed as a festival of ‘friends, love, and infinite freedom’. It ended with a pogrom. She was the only survivor. Following the belated arrival of an Israeli security force, 260 bodies were discovered, some mutilated:

‘They were all over the place with automatic weapons. They were standing next to cars starting to shoot but I realised it was very easy to get killed because everyone was going everywhere. The terrorists [it is BB policy not to use the word, unless, as here, it is quoted speech.] were coming from four or five places so we didn’t know whether to go here, so then I got into my car again and drove a little bit more. Some people were shooting at me. I left the car and started to run. I saw a place with many pomelo trees and I went there. So I was in the middle of this field and I was lying on the floor. It was the second hiding place I found and they were all around me. They were going tree by tree and shooting. Everywhere. From two sides. I saw people were dying all around. I was very quiet. I didn’t cry I didn’t do anything. But I was on the one hand breathing, saying, “OK I’m going to die. It’s

OK, just breathe, close your eyes” because it was shooting everywhere, it was very close to me. Then I hear the terrorist open a big van and get more weapons from this car. They were in the area for three hours. No one was there, no one. Just all there terrorists. They were very close to me and my leg was shaking. I tried and did my best, I moved a little bit and when they were in this side I heard them talking Arabic.’

On October 20, 2013, the BBC website carried a report on the recovery of corpses of Jews murdered in the Hamas pogrom of October 7:

‘Recovery teams on Wednesday [October 18] pulled a woman’s body from the rubble in Kibbutz Be-eri. She was naked, her feet bound with metal wire. One of the teams said the bodies of more than 20 children had been found nearby, tied together and burned...At one centre, we were shown more than a dozen shipping containers their shelves stacked with body bags of all different sizes. [One staff officer told the reporter]: “I didn’t see one body that had been shot just once. In each body, I saw abuses and torture, and so many cuts, so many gunshots, so many bruises to the head and to the limbs.”’

On October 23, more than 100 journalists from across the world, some of them war reporters, viewed a private screening in Jerusalem of a 43 minute film, comprised entirely of footage from body cams worn by Hamas invaders on October 7. Some of those present would have been the employees of media that accepted as true the Hamas lie that Israel had fired the missile that landed in the car park of a Gaza City hospital on October 17. Some in the audience, composed mainly of war reporters, were visibly traumatised by what they saw. Here are some excerpts of comments on the film:

‘In one piece of footage, a Hamas terrorist [if the BBC will permit] screams “Allah Akbar” as he tries to behead a dead man with a shovel. Another clip shows terrorists [ditto] entering a house and talking to each other as a small girl aged about eight hides under a table. One of them proceeds to shoot her dead...A father and two sons (roughly seven and nine) running for their lives in their underwear into what appears to be a shelter with an open entrance. A Hamas terrorist [ditto] throws a hand grenade into the shelter, killing the father, and badly injuring the two boys, who run back into the house. Further footage shows Hamas terrorists [ditto] entering a house, where a small girl is seen hiding under a table. After some talking they shoot and kill the girl as she hides under the table. Hard to say how old she is but she looks like seven to nine years old...’

The following recorded exchanges were played to the UN Security Council on October 25, in reply to the comment made the previous day by its Brazilian Secretary General that the Hamas pogrom of October 7 ‘did not happen in a vacuum’.

Terrorist: ‘Hi dad...I’m talking to you from Mefalsim. Open my WhatsApp and you will see all those [I] killed. Look how many I killed with my own hands! Your son killed Jews! It’s inside Mefalsim, dad.’

Dad: 'May God protect you.'

Terrorist: 'Dad, I'm talking to you from a Jewish woman's phone. I killed her, and I killed her husband. Dad, ten with my own hands! Dad, open WhatsApp and see how many I killed Dad. Ten! Ten with my own hands. Their blood is on their hands! [And so said the Secretary General of the United Nations.] Put Mom on.'

Mom: 'Oh my son, *God bless you!* [My emphasis]'

Terrorist: 'I swear ten with my own hands, mother. I killed ten with my own hands.'

There is no other animal species on our planet that behaves remotely like the sadistic pogromists of Hamas, the heroes of the Corbynista left. And it required a religion, the one, not co-incidentally, admired by Corbyn himself, to infuse with the necessary loathing of the Jews the one species that does.

On October 24, 2023, Ivy League University of Berkely endorsed the following Email, sent to students by one of its teaching staff, Victoria Huynh:

'Hi everyone

We are offering a field trip and/or field trip opportunity.

1) Students can attend the national student walkout tomorrow against the settler/colonial occupation of Gaza ['occupied' by Hamas since 2006] (info attached below) OR

2) Students can watch a short documentary on Palestine and call/email your local California representative using this linktree. Doing so will count either count as a field trip or an extra five points on the field category of your grade. Section 101/102 students can email me...For sections 101/102 we will spend some time talking about Palestine's history in relation to class concepts like colonialism, imperialism and Third World Solidarity.' [But not the 'class concept' of the two Hamas billionaires, Muza Abu Marzuk, \$2.3 billion, and Khaled Mashaal, \$2.6 billion, who rule Gaza from their five star hotel in Qatar.]

This war, like that of Ukraine's against Russia, is one of Western civilisation against Eastern barbarism, and of the twenty first century against the Dark Ages. And, as such, it must end, not like the First World War, but the Second, with Israel's enemies crushed, and their leaders brought to trial for genocide. Netanyahu too should stand trial as a politician who made his career as Israel's staunchest defender against Palestinian terrorism, but when the time came to act on that claim, left his country totally unprepared, preferring instead to employ the IDF for protecting illegal land seizures by West Bank ultra-orthodox 'settlers'. In a poll conducted days after the invasion, 86% of respondents agreed that Netanyahu had failed to protect Israel from its Jihadi enemies.

Afterword: You are my Sunshine

The election on September 2015 of Jeremy Corbyn as leader of the Labour Party with 59% of first preference votes cast should have come as no surprise to those who were familiar with the ways of the far left. As I have argued in the main body of this work, given a favourable conjuncture of events and forces, and the incompetence and cowardice of its opponents, the far left can exert an influence out of all proportion to its numerical strength. Emulating their Bolshevik exemplars in their capture of the Russian Soviets in 1917, albeit on a far more modest scale and with less disastrous consequences, they have time and again proved themselves past masters in the art of subverting and then manipulating the machinery of organisations and institutions created by others for other purposes. Corbyn, who until the summer of 2015 was deservedly largely unknown to the general public and even to most Labour voters, bumbled as much as burst onto the UK political scene not because he possessed any great political acumen or charisma, but because, as much to his own surprise as anyone else's, he found himself serving as the fulcrum of three largely disparate movements with which he had shared an involvement. Of the first two, one was quite recent, comprising largely young anti-austerity activists; the other consisting of residual and recently revived 'Old Labour' leftists. Though generationally distinct, both had been concerned mainly with domestic economic and social issues. The third was the anti-Zionist movement, an amalgam of the Sharia left and Muslim pressure groups, whose emergence and convergence dated back to 9/11 and the Iraq War of 2003. The two entirely distinct policy concerns could not be easily reconciled. Corbyn's Hamas 'friends', whose Covenant claimed that socialism was an invention of the World Jewish Conspiracy, were no more concerned with the parlous state of the UK's National Health Service than the patients in its under-funded hospitals were obsessed with the destruction of the state of Israel and the extermination of the Jews, both being the explicit goals of Hamas.

Corbyn's election and then, a year later, re-election with a larger majority, were all the more remarkable in that well-publicised revelations concerning his numerous and long-standing associations and joint activities with Islamic theocrats, Irish terrorists, Latin American *caudillos*, Jewish conspiracy theorists and Holocaust deniers had not worked to his disadvantage amongst those who cast their votes for him. If anything, they may have operated in the opposite direction. In the Middle East, however, his election received, to put it mildly, a mixed reception. Correctly describing Corbyn as a 'leftist MP who has empathised with Hezbollah and Hamas', the *Israeli Times* reported that 'British Jews were alarmed by his ties to Holocaust deniers, terrorists and some outright anti-Semites'. For exactly these same reasons, the *Al-Risalah* Hamas website hailed the new Labour Leader as 'one of the most prominent British figures who voiced solidarity with the Palestinian cause and declared his rejection of the Gaza war'. (but not the rocket attacks, tunnelling and murder of three Jews that provoked it.) A year later, it was revealed that during the course of Corbyn's campaign for the Labour Party leadership he had been sent a cheque for £10,000 by Friends of Al-Aqsa, an organisation whose leader, Ismail Patel, was known to be in sympathy with Hamas. Corbyn's former Iranian employers, the executioners of Kurds, gays, feminists, leftists, poets, trade unionists and secularists, were likewise predictably delighted with their useful idiot's election

victory, with a regime spokesman laughably describing him, with no apparent intended irony, as a 'lifelong peace and human rights activist'. This from the theocracy that rejects the very concept of human rights and promises to 'wipe Israel off the map', and about a 'peace activist' who counted anti-Semitic terrorists among his 'friends' and in the columns of the Stalinist *Morning Star*, concocted pretexts for President Putin's illegal occupations and annexations. Syed Salman Safavi, a political adviser to Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei, praised Corbyn for his opposition to NATO and his insistence that to 'ensure security [sic] in the Middle East, Hezbollah, Hamas and Iran need to participate in the dialogue [sic] and in the exchange of views.' Quite aside from his anti-Zionism, it was only to be expected that Corbyn's anti-western stance should earn him plaudits in Moscow. Putin's Ambassador to the UK, Alexander Yakovenko, praised the newly elected Labour leader for his 'opposition to military interventions of the west [those of the Kremlin were another matter], support for the UK's nuclear disarmament [though not Russia's, with its 7,500 nuclear warheads, the world's largest nuclear arsenal, compared with the UK's 215] and conviction [shared by US President Donald Trump] that NATO had outstayed its *raison d'être*.' (Russia's military budget had expanded by 59% between 2012 and 2015)

Shortly after his election, Corbyn, attended a state banquet at Buckingham Palace for the visiting Chinese President Xi Jinping where, according to the Guangdong Province-based *South Metropolis Daily*, they had a 'cordial and constructive encounter'. (In 2019, he declined a similar invitation when Trump was the guest, only to then to request a private meeting, which Trump turned down.) This was standard protocol for such meetings and tells us nothing. More informative was the comment by an academic at the Shanghai International Studies University, who ventured the thought that the Chinese President's interest in the Labour Leader could have been aroused by his belief that 'Corbyn's ideas about socialism and the working class are similar to the ideology of our country's ruling party.' Support for this supposition was leant credibility when, in the debate on his Tory opposite number's Autumn Statement, Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell quoted from Chairman Mao's Little Red Book on how to conduct economic policy. Perhaps McDonnell was unaware that in Mao's 'Great Leap Forward' of 1958, the 'Great Helmsman' ordered his serfs to neglect their farms and instead devote their energies to producing in 'people's communes' what inevitably proved to be useless, sub-standard steel to accelerate, Stalin fashion, China's industrialisation. The result was a Mao-made famine and 45 million deaths by starvation.

It was not only Mao's economic policies that appealed to McDonnell. Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor also revealed he possibly had a hankering after the way China's despot dealt with his political opponents in his so-called 'Cultural Revolution', when he described a Tory minister as 'a stain on humanity' and asked, 'why aren't we lynching this bastard?' Undoubtedly McDonnell had his own special take on Corbyn's 'kinder politics', at a London Momentum rally, deriding his leader's Parliamentary opponents as 'fucking hopeless', a term he afterwards justified as a 'normal political description'. At the same event, held to celebrate Corbyn's inclusion on the ballot in the 2016 leadership contest, another speaker, perhaps, like McDonnell striving to establish his proletarian *bona fides*, bellowed 'Blair, fuck you', while a third called those MPs whose resignation from Corbyn's shadow front bench team had triggered the contest, 'lying dishonest leaders with no

values', begging the obvious question...why had Corbyn appointed them in the first place? Not only McDonnell seemed unable to contain his admiration for China's ultra-Stalinist mass murderer. Back in 2008, when Diane Abbott suggested on a TV political chat show that Mao 'on balance [sic] did better than harm', former Tory politician Michael Portillo challenged her to name 'the good things Mao did that made up for the sixty million people he murdered.' Unperturbed by the death tally, which she did not deny, Abbott stuck to her guns. Resorting to the Stalinist mantra, 'no omelettes without egg shells', she argued in Mao's defence that 'he led his [sic] country from feudalism, he helped to defeat the Japanese, and he left his [sic] country on the verge of the great economic success they are having now.' (The reader will recall that Noam Chomsky made a similar claim for the 'positive side' of the Pol Pot regime, just as Seumas Milne had for Stalin's) Ironically, the 'success' that China's new billionaire elite were enjoying had been achieved by jettisoning the disastrous economic policies pursued by Mao and recommended by McDonnell. Informed viewers must have been left wondering why the overcoming of feudalism, a system dominated by a tiny minority of wealthy landlords, the defeat of Japan, which involved the killing of Japanese soldiers not Chinese civilians, and economic growth, necessitated the premature deaths of around ten per cent of China's population. Mao's foreign policy had been no less, how shall we say, unorthodox, with Peking enjoying, like Corbyn's hero Fidel Castro, the best of diplomatic relations with Franco Spain and, following his quasi-fascist military coup in 1973, President Pinochet of Chile.

Sympathies for totalitarian and terrorist mass murderers extended beyond Corbyn's shadow cabinet. *Guardian* journalist and Stalin apologist Seumas Milne was inducted into Corbyn's inner circle with the exalted title of 'Director of Strategy and Communications'. He shared his chief's admiration for Hamas, saluting to cheers at an anti-Israel rally its 'spirit of resistance' that 'will not be broken'. But not only for Hamas. In his own version of 'they had it coming', two days after 9/11, he wrote that al-Qaeda's nearly 3,000 civilian victims were 'reaping a dragon's teeth harvest they themselves [sic] sowed', while London's 7/7 was 'driven by world-wide anger at US-led domination and occupation of Muslim countries', the only surprise being that it was 'so long coming'. Milne did not explain why randomly selected airline passengers, New York office workers, firepersons and police officers and London commuters had to be murdered in order to expiate the guilt of US policy makers. Corbyn's Stop the War Coalition comrade, Lindsey German, whom, the reader will recall, in the interests of placating the homophobia and misogyny of the Sharia left's Muslim comrades, had advocated the ditching the 'shibboleths' of gay and women's rights and approved of gender segregation at public meetings, had a similar 'take' on the murder of a rabbi and three Jewish school children in Toulouse in March 2012. She began by seeming to agree that 'no one can justify these attacks'; only then to do just that: 'but [there is always a 'but'] the shootings in Toulouse are the terrible and disastrous outcome [not of Islamic anti-Semitism, as one might naively suppose, but] the West's war policies and anti-Muslim racism'. 'Our fault', again. When German delivered on the Coalition's official website this apology for what was so clearly an atrocity fuelled, not by opposition to specifically French or more generally, Western foreign policy, but purely by hatred of the Jews, Corbyn was Chairman of the movement that published it.

Given Milne's predilection for the indiscriminate murder of civilians, it is no surprise that like Abbott had for Mao, he found good things to say about Stalin, with his death count of at least 20 million, a total Milne claimed was 'wildly exaggerated' - just like the number of Jews murdered by the Nazis, said his Jihadi comrades. In what amounted to a leftist analogue of Holocaust revisionism, Milne claimed that Stalin's regime was motivated by 'genuine idealism', and 'for all its brutalities [sic], communism in the USSR delivered rapid industrialisation, mass education and job security[sic]'. Yes, there is always plenty of work for slaves. What Milne described as Stalin's 'genuine idealism' was responsible for three famines, in which at least 15 million died and countless others were driven to eating their own dead children, and a reign of terror that sent millions to their deaths, either by shooting, or starvation and disease in Siberian and Arctic slave camps. As for 'rapid industrialisation', being geared almost totally to Stalin's military requirements, it reduced living standards for all but the Bolshevik elite to levels lower than they had been under the last of the tsars. Milne's apologia for Stalin was no different to nostalgic old Nazis who used to say that 'Hitler built the *Autobahn*, gave everyone a job, and restored Germany self-respect.'

It is worthy of note that at the same time as hack historians in Putin's Russia were rehabilitating Stalin precisely along the lines indicated by Milne, Corbyn was praising Milne as 'a man of immense [sic] intellect and a scholar'. In his student days, one fellow Oxford undergraduate recalls that 'he spent his entire time at Balliol wearing a Mao jacket and talking with a fake Palestinian accent. It was like a performance art, the sort of thing Gilbert and George would do. He launched a string of motions in the Junior Common Room attacking Israel.' What better credentials could there be for the post of Corbyn's 'Director of Strategy and Communications'?

Hard-core Corbynistas such as McDonnell, Murray, Livingstone, Milne and Abbott took in their stride indiscriminate terrorism and the deaths of millions for goals that invariably, whatever their claimed intrinsic worth, always required the suppression of democracy and individual freedom, and invariably inflicted the greatest harm on those they purportedly were intended to benefit. For example, aside from swelling the bank accounts of arms dealers and providing a jet-set life style for the representatives of various terrorist movements, what benefits had anti-Zionism brought to the Arabs of the Middle East? Likewise, the only beneficiaries of more than a century of suffering, sacrifice, famine and terror inflicted on the peoples of Russia since the Bolshevik coup of 1917 were the kleptocratic Putinista clique that spent most of its time on so called yachts the size of battleships, anchored along the coast of the western Mediterranean.

It was this same clique that Corbyn and his immediate circle saw as a bulwark against the expansion of democracy into the western reaches of Stalin's former empire. As always, double standards were in play. There were occupations and occupations, some good, some bad, just like certain military 'operations'. Should Israel successfully, and with minimum force, defend itself in response to terrorist attacks, as it did in 2014, 2021 and 2023, after being bombarded by Hamas rockets, the cry would go up of a Zionist genocide of the Palestinians, or, as Milne described it, 'the killing of civilians by Israel on an industrial scale'. But when in October 2016, Putin intensified his killing of Syrians 'on an industrial scale' by bombing an aid convey trying to reach Aleppo, Milne claimed that condemning such actions 'diverted attention' from western military operations in

the region, which of course Corbyn had repeatedly opposed. When, in response to the Russian bombing of Syria, Labour MP Ann Clwyd proposed protest demonstrations outside the Russian embassy, Stop the War Coalition Deputy Chairman Chris Nineham, in an interview on BBC Radio Four, invoked the Chomsky principle: 'Our focus is on what our government is doing. If we demonstrate outside the Russian embassy, it wouldn't make a blind bit of difference to what Putin does, because we are in the west and we are Britain.' And this is called internationalism? Strange, because such geographical considerations never prevented the Coalition from demonstrating outside the US and Israeli embassies. And for best part of a decade, Grosvenor Square was the scene of a succession of massive protests against the US military involvement in Vietnam. Nineham tortuously tried to explain why his Coalition had not and would not become involved in any anti-Putin protests, nor indeed against the actions, no matter how belligerent, of any non-western state or movement: 'We were set up as a coalition in response to 9/11 [which the SWP, the Coalition's main initiators, defended] and in response to the Western, British-supported drive to war back in 2001, and that is our focus'. Nineham concluded his interview with an unambiguous assertion of Leninist defeatism, that the Coalition's mobilisation against the threat of a 'confrontation' between 'Russia and the Western powers, including Britain required 'opposing the west', that is, to take the side of the west's enemies. (As we have seen, this became the stance adopted by the Coalition in response to Putin's invasion of Ukraine in 2022. See also Appendix XIV)

Corbyn, we will recall, was a founder in 2001, and then from 2011, Chairman of the avowedly anti-Western, pro-Jihadi Coalition until his election as Leader of the Labour Party in September 2015. At no time during his high-profile involvement with the Coalition did he dissent from its founding principle, enunciated in 2006 by its National Officer, John Reece: 'Socialists should unconditionally stand with the oppressed against the oppressor, even if the people who run [sic] the oppressed country are undemocratic, and persecute minorities, like *Saddam Hussein*'. (Emphasis added) How George Orwell would have loved that. In the name of 'standing with the oppressed' it was quite in order to support even a fascist dictator who waged a genocidal war to subjugate a rebellious 'minority', the Kurdish 'western pawns'. It was from this anti-western and more specifically, anti-Israeli (and anti-Jewish) political milieu that Corbyn emerged to become Leader of the Labour Party. Some might be puzzled as to why Corbyn, a 'peace campaigner', had chosen to collaborate over the years with movements and individuals who had waged and advocated a war of terror against Israel, and identify himself with regimes that used murderous violence against their own citizens, as in Syria, Nicaragua, Venezuela and Iran. They also might find strange, given what he frequently declared to be his unequivocal commitment to world peace and human rights, Corbyn's selection of a top team composed largely of supporters of Islamic Jihadism, endorsers of Putin's expansionist foreign policy, and apologists for Maoist and Stalinist mass murder. And yet there was no mystery here. The already-discussed Chomsky principle, according to which the only legitimate target of protest and political action is one's own government, was self-evidently the one that guided Corbyn's foreign and in certain respects, such as defence, his domestic policies. It went like this: Putin can bomb and assassinate whom he likes, Assad can massacre whom he likes, Jihadis can murder whom they like, the Ayatollahs can hang whom they like, Maduro can rig elections when he

likes, the Islamic State can rape, behead, burn and torture whom it likes...they are not our enemies. Indeed, in as much as they help our struggle to undermine western imperialism, they are our allies, even if it is not opportune for a Leader of the Labour Party to say so openly. The enemy, western imperialism, is here, in London, and in Paris and Berlin, and above all in Washington and Jerusalem.

That is why I call Corbyn's 'peace campaigning' 'selective', because in essence, it is simply a mask for defeatism and, in a state of war, potentially treasonous. It had significant antecedents. In the run-up to the Second World War, British pacifists, aristocrats and fascists called for an 'understanding' with Nazi Germany, while in the Cold War that followed it, Stalinist-controlled 'peace movements' specialised in enlisting naïve and dim-witted 'peace campaigners' of the Corbyn brand, 'useful idiots' as Lenin called them, who could then be easily prevailed upon, sometimes after a Potemkin visit to the USSR, and despite Russia having by far the largest military capability in the world, to say nice words about the Kremlin's peaceful intentions, while staging demonstrations at home demanding that the west disarm itself unilaterally. Corbyn, we will recall, had been a member of CND since the age of 15, and more recently, served as its vice President and vice Chair. But this too was *deja vue*. Well into the Second World War, the Peace Pledge Union followed an identical policy, performing the most incredible contortions in condemning the Allied war against the Axis powers as immoral while at the same time, dismissing out of hand accounts of the horrors of Hitler's Reich as Allied war propaganda. (See appendix VIII) George Orwell summed up the consequences of their stance rather well: 'Since pacifists have more freedom of action in countries where traces of democracy survive, pacifism can act more effectively against democracy than for it. Objectively, the pacifist is pro-Nazi.' And in the era of the Cold War, pro-Soviet and today, pro-Putin and pro-Jihadi.

In 2018, the Anne Frank Trust appointed as its Head a Quaker, Tim Henderson who then, as we have seen, presided over the Trust's infiltration by anti-Semitic, pro-Jihadi Muslims. Today, the Society of Friends, for all its unconditional commitment to non-violence, collaborates in the BDS movement with quite openly anti-Semitic advocates of *Jihad* against Israel, and if not in so many words, condones acts of terror against the Jewish state, with statements such as, 'before we deplore [Palestinian] terrorism, it is essential to recognise clearly and fully whose "terrorism" came first, so that we can assess what is cause and what is effect.' (This was the refrain that resounded round the world when Israel fought back against the Hamas invasion of 2023.) The 'terrorism that came first' was that of the five Arab states that invaded and attempted to obliterate Israel on the very day of its birth, May 14, 1948. The Quaker stance on the Middle East was a re-run of its position on the Cold War, when, in 1947, it blamed the USA for Stalin's hostility towards the West.

Let us look more closely at some of the mobilising forces behind the Corbyn throne. One was Momentum and its organiser James Schneider. Very free in his condemnation of what he called 'comfortable elite liberals', Schneider was himself just that. The son of a shady multi-millionaire property tycoon, his irresistible ascent to Oxford, where he studied theology (sic), began with attendance at the elite Oxford Dragon Prep School, followed by spells at two no less exclusive and extremely expensive public, that is to say, private schools, Winchester and St Pauls. (Two other top Corbynista silver spoons, Milne and Murray, followed the same educational path leading from Winchester to Oxford) So much for Schneider's

simulated contempt for the 'comfortable elite'. His liberalism (purely nominal, in the light his reputation for inciting Momentum thuggery) flourished briefly while at Oxford, when he became President of the university's Liberal Democratic Society, during the period when the party was in coalition with the Tories. After voting Liberal Democrat at the 2015 General Election, within a matter of weeks Schneider re-surfaced as a born-again Corbynite, his previous total lack of any identification with left wing politics proving no obstacle to his subsequent meteoric rise as a high priest of the Corbynista cult. Such men are evidently born to rule. In this new persona, the theology graduate could be seen parading in public sporting a red T shirt emblazoned with the moto 'Jeremy Corbyn for Labour Leader', the all too familiar spectacle of a thoroughly spoilt upper-class playboy savouring the thrill and notoriety of Momentum's *épater la bourgeoisie* style of politics.

Those most zealous in their devotion to (and in some cases, also manipulation of) the Corbynista cult, were recruited from a new breed of leftist-posturing, self-righteous, self-promoting gilded youth, ever-ready to jump on any bandwagon that promised to inject some spice into their hitherto jaded lives. Below them were used be called 'rentamob', up for any cause going, in this case first as the foot soldiers of the British wing of the US 'Black Lives Matter' campaign, who when its day was done, then took up the cause of trans activism. The main form of protest engaged in (briefly, before they got bored) by its UK chapter was to cause as much disruption as possible to the lives of ordinary people, for example by blocking access to airports in peak holiday periods. Those who tend to find conspiracies lurking around every political corner can on this occasion be forgiven for suspecting that preventing working class families bound for sunnier climes from catching their booked flight was calculated to repel and not attract support for black victims of police violence. But given the protestors social background, should we be surprised at such behaviour? Only those with a profound contempt for the 'masses' they fondly imagine they are destined to liberate could, without any moral qualms, indulge in such conduct.

Among the all-white black freedom fighters gracing the London magistrates court in September 2016 on charges of Aggravated Trespass at London's City Airport were the triple-barrelled Natalie Geraldine Twistleton-Wyykeham-Fiennes, at 25, then still living at her parents' £2 million mansion off Clapham Common (occupation, baby-sitter); Esme Waldron, who described herself as an 'expert on lesbian culture'; Alex Etchart, (occupation, 'youth empowerment' with a degree in 'ethnomusicology' and director of The Sex Workers' Opera); with only two barrels, Sam Lund-Market (occupation, University Environmental Officer) and Debora Francis-Grayson, at 31, still to complete her PhD in 'Media and Communications'. Such pedigree, in the normal run of things, would consign this parasitic crew to the deepest of the dungeons reserved for those cursed by their 'white privilege' But like others of similar provenance, they had at least been sufficiently street-wise to avoid this designation by nailing their family escutcheons to the mast of the latest fashionable cause. I can write the script. 'You say we are rich and white? True. But in our hearts, we are poor and black. And next week we will all be Muslim women, posing for the cameras in our burkas outside the French embassy.'

Readers will no doubt recall that especially in recent years, the left has with some justice derided the Tory party as one dominated by 'toffs'. Indeed, the EU referendum battle was essentially one between two Bullingdon Club Tories, Cameron of Eaton and Oxford and Johnson, of Eaton and Oxford. Labour's token

pro-Remain campaign was also conducted - and, some say, effectively sabotaged, by two champagne Corbynistas, Seumas Milne of Winchester and Oxford and James Schneider of... Winchester and Oxford. And what of the credulous crank who was the UK's Prime Minister-in waiting? As befitted one who throughout his Parliamentary career had shown himself to be incapable of consistent and serious thought about anything of note, Corbyn's main areas of political involvement had ranged from Stalinist regimes and third world dictators to Irish terrorism and Islamic Jihadism. Earlier in his career, when Soviet-style communism still seemed a going concern, Corbyn began writing regularly for the pro-Moscow *Morning Star*, successor to the Communist Party's *Daily Worker*. He is even said to have explored on a motorbike, with Diane Abbott riding pillion, the Kremlin's East German prison as a guest of Brezhnev's puppet jailer Erich Honeker. (This became one of a series of hilarious episodes in *Corbyn the Musical*) Then, with the breaching of the prison's wall and the ensuing spectacular collapse of the entire Soviet bloc, while retaining more than a residual loyalty to post-Soviet Russia, his strongest attachments shifted to the intransigently anti-Western and anti-Zionist Iran of the Ayatollahs, Palestinian Jihadis, and any Latin American regime, no matter how repressive, that displayed the continent's traditional and often well-merited hostility towards the Great Satan in Washington.

Corbyn was not alone in his indifference to the authoritarian practises of the regimes he supported. In 2008, no fewer than 69 MPs, 65 of them Labour, backed a Parliamentary motion which ignored Cuba's appalling human rights record (including torture) and instead, applauded the Castro one-party dictatorship for its 'achievements'. Among those signing along with Corbyn were some of the usual suspects, including former Saddam stooge George Galloway of the Sharia 'Respect', and two of Corbyn's most loyal future shadow ministers, John McDonnell and once again, Diane Abbott. Inevitably, Castro's death in November 2016 found Corbyn heaping the usual effusions of praise on Latin America's longest surviving dictator, the *Lider Maximo* having not only outlasted the military juntas in Chile, Brazil and Argentina but, like the Kim dynasty which has ruled the slave camp that is North Korea since 1945, also ensured that all power remained in his family by abdicating in 2008 in favour of his younger brother Raúl without even the pretence of an election. He inherited a totalitarian regime that held more than 200 political prisoners in its jails, allowed only one party, permitted no free trade unions and ensured that all the media spoke with one voice. None of this troubled Comrade Corbyn, any more than it did the dictator-doting clique who comprised his core leadership team.

Corbyn's hyperbole ran riot: 'Fidel Castro was a massive figure in the history of the whole planet [sic], ever since the revolution of 1959.' Perhaps peace campaigner and CND Vice-President Corbyn was alluding to those days in October 1962 when Castro brought the 'whole planet' to the verge of nuclear war between the USSR and the USA by agreeing to the stationing of Soviet missiles on Cuban territory...an act of sheer madness. And before elevating Castro to the pantheon, perhaps those mourning him needed reminding that his defiance of the USA not only won him the admiration of the left, but of General Franco, who saw in Castro's regime sweet revenge for Spain's defeat by the hated Yankees in the Cuban war of 1898 and more generally, for displacing Spain as the major power in Latin America.

As for Castro, in his youth, he was an avid reader of the writings of Jose Antonio Primo de Rivera, the founder of Spanish fascism. So, it should hardly be cause for surprise that acting on the principle that the enemy of my enemy is my friend, from the outset, Castro and Franco were on the best of terms. Every January 1, the official anniversary of the seizure of power by the Castro movement in 1959, Franco would send a telegram of greetings to his Cuban counterpart, and, incomprehensible though this must seem to those for whom the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939 is a closed book, Castro would return the compliment. When Castro's ambassador to Spain, Jose Miro Cardona, first presented himself to the *Caudillo*, at the end of the audience, Franco asked 'How is Fidel doing?' and then with some vehemence added, 'Tell Fidel to give hell to the Americans'. In return, the Franco regime defied pressure from Washington to support the US embargo on trade with Cuba and provided the only air link with western Europe, a solidarity that was publicly acknowledged when Castro declared three days of official mourning on the fascist dictator's death in November 1975, and by the Cuban Communist Party's daily paper, *Granma*, which carried on its front page the tragic news that 'Franco is Dead', and featured a tribute to the butcher who in the Spanish Civil War of 1936 to 1939, secured, with the aid of the Pope, Hitler and Mussolini, crushed the Spanish left and establish a clerical fascist dictatorship. Castro is also on record for praising Franco as 'honourable', a man of 'moral and political stature' for whom he had 'a certain admiration'. For his part, Franco described Castro as 'very intelligent' and 'a great strategist' who had brought Cuba 'needed change'.

Just as Franco defied the western boycott of Cuba, so Castro in return defied the western left's boycott of Franco Spain. And just as Castro's overtly friendly relations with a regime that had marched to power over the corpses of hundreds of thousands of slaughtered leftists did not find favour with the Spanish government-in-exile, any more than it did with the underground leftist resistance in Spain, the the Castro regime did not look kindly on the campaign to isolate and weaken the Franco regime when leftists advocated the boycott of Spanish tourism, a growing source of revenue for the country's investment-starved economy. For example, Castro's second in command, Che Guevara, evidently considered himself exempt from this policy, because he was caught on camera strolling round Madrid and at a bull fight, always accompanied by a bodyguard provided by Franco's red-hunting security service. Also captured on camera, socialising with the Cuban Ambassador to the UK at a Cuba Solidarity trade union garden party in 2016, was 'special guest' Jeremy Corbyn, evidently unconcerned that like Franco Spain, there were no free trade unions, press or elections in one-party Cuba. (In its bogus general elections, the number of candidates, as in Andrew Murray's 'peoples [North] Korea', invariably equals the number of seats.) Another 'special guest' in attendance was John McDonnell, then Corbyn's Shadow Chancellor, one-time Deputy to GLC mayor Ken Livingstone, a former co-editor with Livingstone of the Gadhafi-funded *Labour Herald*, and as such, close associate of the *soi-disant* Trotskyist Gadhafi-funded Workers Revolutionary Party. He surely should have known that following his release from a Mexican jail in 1960 after serving 20 years for the assassination of Leon Trotsky, 'Hero of the Soviet Union' Ramon Mercader served Castro as his special adviser and Inspector-General of Cuba's prisons, home to Cuba's democratic opposition.

With the semi-retirement and then death of Castro, Corbyn's Latin exemplar became the Peronist-style President of Venezuela and ally of Putin and Iran, Hugo

Chavez who, like his successor, the fraudulently elected Nicolas Maduro, specialised in visiting unprecedented poverty and misery on his people; no mean achievement in a country endowed with the world's largest oil reserves. Livingstone shared his long-standing collaborator's admiration for Chavez. In 2006, as Mayor of London, he hosted a special event held in Chavez's honour at the capital's City Hall, while on Chavez's death in 2013, the future leader of the Labour Party posted a tribute to the architect of his nation's tragedy on his website: 'Thanks Hugo Chavez for showing that the poor matter and wealth can be shared. He made massive contributions to Venezuela and a very wide world'. His hero, who once famously declared that 'being rich is bad', certainly knew how to 'share the wealth', albeit unevenly. By plundering his regime's oil revenues, he was also able to make 'massive contributions' to those closest to him, in the first place his daughter (and Ambassador to the United Nations) Maria Gabriela, to the tune of \$4.2 billion, all of it of course invested in foreign banks, just in case. Even this immense sum, filched from a people whose poverty was among the worst in South America, was dwarfed by the \$11.2 billion stashed away in a Swiss bank account by Chavez's Treasury (sic) Minister Alejandro Andrade. When, in the wake of the Panama tax haven scandal, Corbyn took to task those world figures who had been proven guilty of 'tax avoidance on an industrial scale', someone should have reminded him of what his kleptocratic comrades had been up to in the years of their misrule. At the time of the President's death, the Chavez clan between them owned 17 country estates covering more than 100,000 acres and liquid assets of \$550 million. Sharing the wealth indeed.

Corbyn's top adviser, 'Spin Doctor' Seumas Milne, waxed no less lyrical. Petro-Chavism had 'redistributed wealth [again!] and power, rejected western neo-liberal orthodoxy [not to speak of western democracy] and challenged imperial domination'...while aligning his country with an expansionist Russia. However, even the effusions of Corbyn and Milne for Chavez were surpassed in their obsequiousness by 9/11 conspiracy film maker 'hug a Muslim' (but preferably not one wearing a suicide vest) Michael Moore: 'Hated by the entrenched classes, Hugo Chavez will live forever in history. My friend [sic], rest finally in a peace long earned.' Corbyn remained loyal to the Chavista cause in the years after its founder's death in 2013, being no less indifferent to his successor's continued violations of human rights. Shortly after Corbyn addressed a London rally in June 2015 praising the Chavista regime for its 'achievements', Amnesty International issued a statement condemning its use of forced labour: 'A new decree establishing that any employee in Venezuela can effectively be made to work in the country's fields as a way to fight the current food crisis is unlawful and effectively amounts to forced labour.' Human Rights Watch issued the following indictment of the abuses perpetrated by Corbyn's Venezuelan comrades:

Under the leadership of President Hugo Chavez and now President Nicolas Maduro, the accumulation of power in the executive branch and erosion of human rights guarantees have enabled the government to intimidate, censor, and prosecute its critics, leading to increasing levels of self-censorship. Leading opposition politicians have been arbitrarily arrested, prosecuted and convicted, and barred from running for office. Police abuse, poor prison conditions, and impunity for security forces when they commit such abuses as arbitrary arrests, beatings, and denial of basic due process remain serious problems. Other concerns include lack of access to basic medicines and supplies - the result of problematic government policies - and continuous harassment of human rights defenders by

government officials.

Another report contained descriptions of tortures that resemble those inflicted on opponents of the far-right regime of General Pinochet in Chile:

Detainees testified in court they had suffered physical abuse that could amount to torture, including brutal beatings and electric shock and threats of rape [sic] or murder...Some detainees said they were tortured to coerce into confessing to crimes, and that SEBIN [the Bolivarian, i.e., Venezuelan National Intelligence Service] agents tape-recorded their confessions.

As a founder of the anti-Western Stop the War Coalition, which he also chaired between 2011 and 2015, and a supporter of any regime, however despotic and domestically unpopular, which pursued an anti-US agenda, not to speak of his impeccable anti-Zionist credentials, there was ample and clear evidence to satisfy the organised far left that Labour's new leader was one of their own. Leading the pack, as one would expect, were Corbyn's long-term collaborators in his various anti-Western enterprises, the Socialist Workers Party. In an official statement, the party 'congratulated Jeremy Corbyn on becoming Labour Party leader', and 'looked forward to continue [sic] to work with [him] and his supporters' in the future.'

The *Guardian* was if anything even more enthusiastic. As one would expect, nothing was said about his anti-Zionist agenda, or the unsavoury company that this obsession had led him to keep as a result of his continuous involvement in Sharia left operations during his years as a back-bencher. One contributor heralded his victory in tones and with prose that were unmistakably messianic: 'There was for me something profoundly satisfying, not to say moving, in the victory of the man who came from nowhere [sic], the man who was reviled by the powerful, the rich and the mighty. [But praised in Moscow and Peking, to name but two of several capitals.] It was almost Biblical: the last became first.' Having found his Messiah, and been born again, 'within in an hour of his winning, I joined the party.' 'Reviled by the powerful and the rich'? It could be Robin Hood...or even Jesus. Let us not forget that the object of this quasi-religious devotion, one that was already resembling that of a cult, was a politician who has spent a substantial part of his career as an MP adulating and even enjoying the hospitality of Latin American caudillos and Jew-killing Jihadis. While of all the national dailies, the *Guardian* certainly had been the most sympathetic to the Corbyn cause, there was at least one writer on its staff whose intellectual self-respect prevented him from succumbing to the sycophantic hero-worship that was already emerging around the new Labour leader. Again, the imagery is Biblical, but the picture that emerges is anything but adulatory:

The cult of Jeremy Corbyn is truly astonishing...every utterance, however gnomic, is now thought to contain a greater truth. [Shades of *The Life of Brian*] Corbyn disciples now regard the man who would turn up at a political rally at the drop of a pamphlet as a seer...He has become a blank slate on which believer's project their dreams. His story could equally be a Biblical parable about patience or a (far-fetched) political satire.

The Life of Jeremy perhaps? Sometimes fact is stranger than fancy. In April 2016, a new show hit a London stage, entitled *Jeremy Corbyn: The Musical*, followed

even more bizarrely, in November by a Corbynista bid to top the Christmas single chart with 'JC for PM for Me', and a riposte from the musical's cast, 'You Needed a Hero - You Got Corbyn'.. The lyrics of the Corbynista entry capture perfectly the banality of great leader's thought processes and the degree of sophistication of his target audience: 'I'm voting Jeremy C [not Labour be it noted] / I like his ideas / they're fair and they're clear / Jezza and me we agree'.

No doubt as a result of his track record as an indefatigable campaigner for any number of Islamic causes, Corbyn's election as Labour Leader aroused hopes in the 'Muslim community' that the party's policies in its areas of special interest were about to change for the better. Two Muslim commentators effused over Corbyn's spectacular eruption onto the political scene. The Vice President of the Muslim Association of Britain and Chairman of Corbyn's local mosque in Finsbury Park (which celebrated the first anniversary of 9/11) saw in Labour's new leader a 'humble and wise man', 'one of very few politicians who recognises that the government must and needs to engage positively with British Muslims'...code for changing its foreign policy, especially with regard to the Middle East. While British Jews, so Muslim pressure groups and Sharia left claimed, acted as a 'Zionist lobby', and therefore should be ignored, Muslims had to be listened to, and their wishes, acted upon. And now that was going to change, because Corbyn, the redeemer of ignored and oppressed Muslims, was not only 'humble and wise'...but also a Titan, one who single-handed had 'shaken the political landscape of Britain'. So said a young Muslim leftist, Rabbil Sidkar, in the *Morning Star*, the Stalinist daily that had over the years regularly featured a column by Corbyn. He pictured the newly-elected leader as a cross between a monk and a Nordic god, 'a quiet, humble [again] and hugely impressive giant [?] who has set off [sic] like a thunderstorm in the Labour Party'. And 'the rumbles are reverberating around the [Muslim] community'. They certainly reached the eager ears of the Council for Muslims in Britain, the influential and publicly-funded Muslim pressure group that like the Muslim Association of Britain, maintained close links with the ultra-conservative and theocratic Muslim Brotherhood, while at the same time collaborating closely with the Sharia left in a number of anti-Zionist enterprises.

The Corbynite movement not only resembled a religious cult. In some ways, it was also an exotic offshoot of the new celebrity-obsessed culture, since it palpably found an echo in a generation reared on a diet of Big Brother, I'm a Celebrity, X Factor, the Apprentice and other similarly inane TV productions, while at the same time fulfilling a need to be identified in some way with a prominent public figure, preferably one that had the aura of anti-establishment notoriety. And as it evolved, the cult also merged with the world of popular culture, staging a series of gigs featuring a Jeremy Anthem and promoted as 'Concerts for Corbyn' (not, as some noted, for Labour or even Socialism) and the marketing of Corbyn kitsch and memorabilia. And for posterity, an oil painting of the Dear Leader Himself, original valued at £300.00, with reproductions priced at £11.18.

In Corbyn we had a celebrity like no other; the image if not the reality of a man of destiny, and yet at the same time simple (to be sure), 'humble', kindly, honest, sincere, work-a-day, a man who despite his advanced years, had the gift of awakening in the young a sense of adventure, optimism and idealism, a preacher with a dream and a message of hope and deliverance, a visionary who was betrayed, reviled and ridiculed by the Judases, many of them also Jews, within his own party, a latter day Pied Piper, an infallible leader whose policy summersaults and

contortions (as for example over Brexit), like those of Hitler and Stalin, either pass unnoticed or were swallowed in one gulp, a seer who had a cure for all ills, not least for those who prefer to avoid the irksome task of thinking for themselves by following a messiah who does their thinking for them. And what thinking! In every respect, Corbyn fitted the bill to perfection. Yet when it came to it, the fates seemed to turn against him. He lost every election he contested under his leadership, whether international, national or local. By September 2019, both his and his party's ratings had sunk to an all-time low, behind not only the Tories, but the Liberal Democrats and the Brexit Party, and with the Greens not far below. Three months later, he led Labour to its worst General Election defeat since 1935. His party, divided from his first days in office, was torn apart by anti-Semitism scandals, for which his obsessive anti-Zionism had been the main catalyst. (See Appendix T) 100,000 members resigned in less than year. There was dissent even among his hitherto closest collaborators. All this and more meant that he would never become Prime Minister. But to his devotees, that hardly mattered, because he made them feel holy and special.

The Corbynistas, a party, or rather church, within a party, except for their overwhelmingly middle-class composition, were heterogonous in the extreme. First there was the Islamic component. Muslim political activists at local and increasingly at national level were mobilised by Corbyn's well-publicised track record as a fanatical anti-Zionist. Then there were the re-activated 'Old Believers', akin to the Russian sect of that name who refused to accept the Church reforms of Peter Great and took themselves off into the Siberian wilderness. Hailing from the election-losing era of Michael Foot and Tony Benn, Labour's Old Believers had reacted in a similar way to the 'New Labour' reforms of Tony Blair, either dropping out of the party altogether, some for pastures Green, or simply lapsing into inactivity. Corbyn, along with a small group of like-minded MPs and seasoned operators, like the former anti-Semitic Labour MP and London Mayor Ken Livingstone, was very much of this generation, but with the crucial difference that he found his new pastures for the most part in the oases of the Middle East. Next, we had the far left. Some were old-guard Stalinists, but the majority were much younger, more aggressive and even thuggish, neo-Trotskyist 'entryists' and leftist students, many of them lobotomised by campus political correctness, zealously anti-Zionist to the point of open anti-Semitism, utterly intolerant of any opinion other than their own, and sanctimonious with it. Via the newly-created 'Momentum' their aim was to transform the Labour Party into one huge 'safe space' where the only ones commanding the platform would be themselves.

Then there were the 'life-stylers', mainly metropolitan, female and upper middle class, and although few in number, possessed of considerable clout in the media and academe. (Thus they were able to impose on Corbyn's replacement, Keir Starmer their agenda of 'identity' politics, with its anti-scientific mumbo jumbo about 'gender' - 'women' with penises and no cervixes.) The irony was that many of the new-wave, far left entryists had looked upon the Blair-era Labour Party as an obstacle on the road to fully blown socialism until Miliband's ill-considered three-pound membership rule provided them with a golden opportunity to elect as leader a figurehead who could be manipulated to serve their own political objectives. They provided the cadre and muscle of the Corbynista Momentum, whose task it was to take over the local machinery of the Labour Party by flooding the constituencies with new and mainly very naive recruits, for whom Corbyn was akin to the guru of

a religious sect. Momentum rallies chanted his name, cultists held aloft home-made banners inscribed 'Corbyn [not Labour] in, Tories out', while the saviour's heretical 'Blairite' Labour Party opponents were cast variously in the roles of Judas and Satan, accompanied by audible mutterings of a 'Zionist Plot'. One constituency party secretary described the tensions that had arisen as result of the Corbynite influx: 'There are members who have been here for 10, 15, 20 years who think he has to go. Those who have joined in the last year think he walks on water. [Believe it or not, there was an attempt to stage such a miracle at the 2017 Brighton Labour Party conference, only to be frustrated by incoming waves activated by Mossad.] There's an almost religious-like following and if you criticise him you're a blasphemer.' (I have been the recipient of exactly this reaction by someone who was not even a Labour Party member.)

It was indeed as the *Guardian* critic said, all rather Biblical, even explicitly so. In my local paper, one enthusiast breathlessly described her conversion at a gathering conducted in a manner more appropriate to a Billy Graham rally: 'We went to a meeting and Christian [?] songs were sung with placards saying "Support Jeremy", nothing but 1,000 people meeting together to support Jeremy'. 'Support *Jeremy*'? But not the Labour Party or socialism. And *Christian* songs? They needed to tread, or rather sing carefully, because Jeremy preferred mosques, and had declaimed his unbounded respect for a religion whose holy book six times instructed Muslims not to take Christians as friends. Perhaps the location explains why on this occasion hymns were in order and not a call to (Muslim) prayer because here was a scene set in the chapel land of South Wales, home of the Christian Revival of 1904-5, not the minarets of Finsbury Park, Bradford or Birmingham. Such converts, and they numbered tens of thousands, believed that at last, after so many betrayals, they had found their leader, the Chosen One, who would guide them to the promised land of true socialism. Spell bound, his audiences hung on his every banal word, clearly believing that he was capable of performing secular miracles that would painlessly transform Britain almost overnight into a land of plenty for the many, not the few.

With regard to foreign policy, as a man of peace (but also as a 'friend' of Jew killing Jihadis) Corbyn had previously made it very clear that he wished to leave both the EU and NATO, and drastically scale down the UK's military budget by not upgrading one of the UK's Trident nuclear submarine fleet. Perhaps he hoped that this would release the revenue required for the funding of his ambitious domestic programme. Anyone who raised the smallest doubts as to the viability of the Corbyn project was liable to be denounced as 'Blairite scum', heckled and jostled at meetings, besieged at their home or their local Labour party offices, accused of involvement in a Zionist plot, and even threatened with rape and death. Like all true believers, nothing could shake their faith. All attacks on the object of their devotion simply served as more proof that he was indeed the chosen one, even though, beginning in the run-up to his election as Labour Leader, irrefutable evidence began to accumulate of the kind of political low-life and decidedly non-socialist company Corbyn had been keeping throughout his Parliamentary career. But no one cared. It was either all lies, or alright. His closest comrades rallied to his defence, no one more enthusiastically than fellow anti-Zionist campaigner, East Germany pillion-rider and anti-white bigot Diane Abbott. (She had opposed the employment of 'blond, blue-eyed' Finnish nurses at an East London hospital where most of the patients were non-white. So much for 'diversity'.) Unable to refute that

her mentor had consorted with known anti-Semites, Jihadis and Holocaust deniers, since the evidence was irrefutable, she offered the following justification for keeping such company:

Jeremy has been an MP for thirty years. In those thirty years he has done thousands [sic] of meetings, rallies, memorial events ...Now if over those thirty years he has been on a platform with someone who is clear is now [sic] an anti-Semite and a Holocaust denier, whatever it is [sic!]...given the chaotic nature of the liberation movement [what kind of 'liberation movement', however chaotic', is represented by anti-Semites and Holocaust deniers?], that will happen. That doesn't make Jeremy a fellow traveller with anti-Semitism.

Yes, it most certainly did, because it 'happened' not just once or twice in 'thirty years', 'chaotically', by chance, but deliberately, consistently and regularly, as the record of these collaborations, many of them videoed, had established. These were no random encounters, but the fruits of a shared cause, the vilification of Israel and the promotion of Jihadi Islam. Corbyn's leading role over decades in a number of anti-Zionist campaigns led him, by his own free choice, to collaborate on the closest terms with those whom Abbott admitted were both anti-Semites and Holocaust deniers *and known to be so at the time*, not subsequently as Abbott implied.

In addition to anti-Semites, other high-profile recruits to the Corbynite cause also came in a wide variety of shapes and sizes. One who attracted particular media attention was Tom O'Carroll. He had been politically active for many years, but had only joined the Barrow Constituency branch of the Labour Party after Corbyn's election as Leader in September 2015. In February 2016, Barrow's Labour MP demanded that O'Carroll be expelled from the Labour Party, not for his pro-Corbyn views, but for his advocacy of sex with children, having served as Chairman of Paedophile Information Exchange, the pressure group founded in 1974 to campaign for change in the law on under-age sex. In 1981 he was jailed for 'corrupting public morals' and again in 2006 for distributing indecent images of children. Such activities and views did not go down well with the average Labour voter, though given the example set by the Prophet Mohammed with his nine-year-old wife Aisha, and bearing in mind the sexual preference of hundreds of convicted Muslim paedophiles, in Rotherham, Oxford, Sheffield, Keighley, Aylesbury, Halifax, Rochdale and a score or more other mainly Labour locations, this may not have been necessarily the case with all male Muslim voters.

Next, we had four high ranking Corbynistas, of whom three were MPs, who also ran afoul of the standards of public conduct one had a right to expect from a politician. First, Clive Lewis. Standing for the first time as the Labour candidate for Norwich in 2015, he was asked by the *New Statesman* whether he took his victory for granted. He replied that he would only lose if he was 'caught with [his] pants down behind a goat with Ed Miliband at the other end'. Once elected, he rapidly proved himself one of Corbyn's loyalist supporters, being one of the 36 MPs who voted for him in the first round of the leadership contest that followed the resignation of Ed Miliband. Once elected, Lewis wasted no time in joining the PLP Labour Friends of Palestine. Could this explain why, despite his lack of Parliamentary experience, Lewis was rewarded with a series of placements in Corbyn's shadow cabinet, first in the Energy and Climate Change team, then Defence, and finally Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy?

All seemed to be going well until he fell out with Corbyn over the Labour leader's switch to a 'hard' Brexit'. Lewis resigned in February 2017 from the Shadow cabinet, while remaining in most other matters a loyal Corbynista. At the Brighton Labour Party conference of September 2017, Lewis attended a Momentum event, where from the platform, he called out to the actor Sam Swann (not a goat this time) to 'get on your knees, bitch'. A Labour Party spokesperson said the language used was 'completely unacceptable and falls far short of the standard expected of Labour MPs.' Lewis later apologised, and that seemed to be that. But then, two months later, as each day, fresh stories broke about alleged sexual misconduct by male MPs, Lewis was accused of sexually harassing a woman at the same Momentum event, which Lewis denied, saying, 'it's not how I roll'. A Labour Party Spokesperson said the complaint was being investigated.

Then there was the sensational case of another anti-Zionist recruit to the Corbyn roster of new MPs, Jared O'Mara, who shared with Lewis what one might describe as a free-wheeling style in matters sexual. Despite twice failing to be elected as a councillor, O'Mara was catapulted into Parliament as Labour MP for Sheffield Hallam in the General Election of June 2017. Momentum activists were mobilised from far and wide to get Jeremy's man in, although his very non-PC past was an open secret. His loyalty to the Corbynista cause, already proven by his high-profile campaigning against Israel, was quickly rewarded, his meteoric ascent continuing when he was appointed by Corbyn to represent the PLP on the House of Commons Women (sic) and Equalities (sic) Select Committee, while still pursuing his commitment, now inside as well as outside the House, to the anti-Zionist cause, being briefed by the Hamas-linked Palestinian Return Centre for this purpose. Those citizens of Sheffield Hallam who believed that an MP's first duty was to represent the interests of their constituents would have been interested to learn that up to the time of his public fall from grace, all three questions asked in the House by O'Mara had concerned Israel, and that a matter of days before Corbyn's representative on the Women and Equalities Selected Committee was exposed as flagrant misogynist, homophobe and racist, their MP was featured in a photo standing between two officials of the same terrorist-linked organisation. Among the issues they discussed was how to organise opposition to the commemoration the 100th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration.

For all his 'life-style' eccentricities, in matters anti-Zionist, O'Mara was decidedly 'on message' That is why, one suspects, even though he had known about the charges against O'Mara for a month, Corbyn did all he could to save him, saying it would be a 'shame' if he had to resign from the Select Committee, while Baroness 'whitewash' Chakrabarti, indulgent, as one would expect on her past form, to a wayward Corbynista, told the BBC, 'people should be allowed to make mistakes'. All in vain, as the uproar in the media and the House grew to such a pitch that O'Mara jumped before he was - reluctantly - pushed. Two postings captured the MP's idiosyncratic approach to 'equality'. One, in the run-up to a football match between England and Spain, went thus: 'Let's beat the Dagos'; and another, in an on-line riposte to a Dane: 'I might be a "ginge" [O'Mara is indeed ginger-haired] but at least I don't practice bestiality like you Danes! Up yours with brass knobs on, pig shagger.' Decency forbids citing most of his 'sexist' and homophobic 'mistakes', which reveal a mind that likening it to a sewer would be a gross insult to any human waste disposal system. Suffice to say, they were hardly the best advertisement for his fitness to serve on the Women and Equality Select Committee.

Gareth Arnold, one of his Parliamentary assistants, described O'Mara as 'the most disgusting morally bankrupt person I have ever had to work with'. On August 23 2019, reports appeared in the media that O'Mara had been arrested by police in connection with another 'mistake', fraud, which led to his being jailed in 2023.

Hot on the heels of the O'Mara scandal came that of Corbyn's Shadow Culture Secretary, Kelvin Hopkins. As Parliament buzzed with reports of sexual misbehaviour by Labour and Tory MPs, it was revealed on November 3, 2017, that the Labour Leader had appointed Hopkins to his post despite being aware that serious charges of sexual harassment had been made against him by a party activist. 'Hard Brexiter' Hopkins, MP for that hotbed of Islamic Jihadism, Luton, where a Muslim Nazi can be elected as a Labour councillor, was another one of the 36 MPs whose votes enabled Corbyn to enter the contest for the Labour leadership in 2015, and was, like all good Corbynista Parliamentarians, also a member of the Labour Friends of Palestine, the up-market counterpart to the anti-Semite infested Palestine Solidarity Campaign, more of which anon. (Appendix T) A posting by a zealous Corbynista, working on the assumption that the women who made these accusations were liars, speculated on their possible source and motive: 'This is another attack. Probably by the establishment, maybe by the Blairite faction and distantly possibly the work of Mossad (given the Israeli aim to stop JC at all costs).' Thus, once again, the Jewish conspiracy.

In the wake of these three cases, each involving a male MP from the small coterie who can be described as belonging to the Corbyn camp, came that of Corbyn's former speech writer (sic) and then his communications manager for the shadow cabinet, David Prescott, son of Corbyn enthusiast and one-time Labour Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott. He was suspended after an unspecified complaint was made against him. Although not eligible for membership of the PLP Labour Friends of Palestine, given his two job descriptions, I would say that the odds were very much in favour of his views on Israel coinciding with those of his employer. Poor Jeremy. He did really pick them. Livingstone, Naz(i) Shah, Lewis, O'Mara, Hopkins and Prescott. How many more? As of January 2019, three. Solicitor, Labour Whip and MP for Peterborough Fiona Onasanya, described by Corbyn as 'this wonderful woman', and who reportedly aspired to be the UK's first black woman Prime Minister, was jailed for three months and barred from the legal profession for perverting the course of justice when she lied to police about a speeding offence, falsely claiming a Russian man was the driver who, as luck would have it, happened to be in his homeland at the time. A devout Christian, she compared her conviction to the sufferings of Jesus on the cross.

Next, Kate Osamor, MP for Edmonton and Corbyn's Shadow International Development Secretary. She lied in a letter to the judge presiding in the trial of her 'beautiful son' Ishmael, a 'person of high integrity' and to boot, a Labour Councillor in Harringay. He was convicted of four charges of possession of illegal drugs with intent to supply. (His other job, on £50,000 per annum, was Parliamentary assistant to his mother.) Interviewed on the doorstep of her £700,000 housing association-funded property by a journalist, she threw a bucket of water over him, told him to 'fuck off' and said 'I should have come down here with a bat and smashed you face in.' Once again, a kinder politics. Kate's mother, Martha, was selected by Corbyn for one of four appointments to the House of Lords as Baroness Osamor, even though in 1990, she had been deselected by the Harringay Labour Party as a councillor, and barred for life from standing for office, after

funding intended for community organisations was subject to ‘unexplained withdrawals and expenditures’ amounting to more than £100,000, some on items of a personal nature. As one would expect of beneficiaries of Corbyn’s patronage, both mother and daughter had impeccable anti-Zionist credentials. Martha had spoken up in support of members expelled for anti-Semitism, while her daughter was a prominent advocate of the BDS policy of boycotting Israel. Sex pests, racists, drug-dealers, embezzlers, anti-Semites, nepotists, perjurers, liars...What a wretched crew of chancers! Some would say Corbyn had brought it on himself, since a hankering for the good life and a loathing of Israel are hardly the best credentials for a responsible politician.

However, despite these causalities, Corbyn could take comfort in that at least one staunchly anti-Zionist replacement was on the way up, namely Nasreen Khan, a prospective candidate for the safe Bradford Council seat of (58% Muslim) Little Horton. (Bradford West, remember, was the seat of the fanatically anti-Zionist Labour MP Naz Shah and before her, the no less anti-Zionist Respect’s George Galloway.) Like her co-religionist in Luton, Councillor Aysegal Gurbuz, Khan had advertised on-line her hatred of the Jews and admiration for Hitler. In one posting, she complained that teachers in her school were ‘brainwashing’ pupils into ‘thinking that the bad guy was Hitler.’ ‘What good have the Jews done in the world?’, she asked, rhetorically. (Perhaps those who award Nobel Prizes could tell her.) Denying that these opinions made her a Nazi (perhaps because it was the Zionists who were supposed to be the Nazis) Khan revealingly explained ‘I am an ordinary[sic] Muslim that had an opinion and put it across. We have worse people than Hitler in the world now...Stop beating a dead horse. The Jews have reaped the reward of playing victim. Enough is enough.’ In the hotbed of Muslim Jew-hatred that was Shah’s Bradford, also notorious for its numerous convicted Muslim gang rapists, these views, infinitely more suited to membership of a Neo-Nazi party than the (pre-Corbyn) Labour Party, did not prove an obstacle to Nasreen Khan becoming one of two candidates for the Little Horton seat.

Another interesting recruit to the Corbyn cause was David Carter. He described himself as a ‘semi-retired international senior manager with over 15 years of extensive experience throughout the Middle East.’ Outraged at what he saw a conspiracy to block the election of Corbyn as leader of the Labour Party, Carter posted a series of comments that left no doubt as to whom he believed was behind it: ‘I will continue to speak out on the smears and slurs aimed against Jeremy Corbyn from the pro-Israeli Jews’. Other postings made it clear it was not only ‘pro-Israeli Jews’ whom he had in mind: ‘Jewish power has the unique capacity to stop anyone talking about Jewish power.’ And yet here was Carter doing just that. Carter fulminated against the ‘pro-Zionist attack on Jeremy Corbyn’ while ‘washed-up Labour failures [possibly a reference to amongst others, Tony Blair, the only Labour leader to win three successive general elections] snap and bark like a pack of toothless dogs.’ Carter claimed that ‘organised Jewry’ was ‘trying to portray Jeremy Corbyn as a kapo at Auschwitz [sic!] in their desperation’. Holocaust denier Carter, amidst this welter of posts exposing the Jewish conspiracy against Corbyn, still found the time to dismiss the Anne Frank diary as a ‘fraud’, unlike Corbyn, who was so obviously the real anti-Zionist deal.

Around the same time, yet another Holocaust denier, Mathew Kees, crawled out of the same latrine, announcing as he did so, ‘Corbyn is great. Am all for him.’ Kees

was also another high-flyer, or so he wanted the world to think, describing himself as a 'renowned [sic] professional photographer, art teacher and sculptor.' Like Carter, Kees believed he was the victim of Jewish persecution, complaining that 'there's no organisation to protect us from Zionist Supremacists.' For all Corbyn's repeated protestations that he was not an anti-Semite, (and his apologists needed to ask themselves why no previous Labour leader had felt obliged to do this) there were many who obviously did not believe him. Some, like Kees and Carter, were themselves anti-Semites, while there were others, both Jew and gentile, including myself, who were not. What is undeniable is that Corbyn attracted the support and adulation of anti-Semites and Neo-Nazis like iron filings to a magnet. Proving the point, we have the intriguing case of Jeremy Corbyn's elder brother, Piers. Whereas his younger brother, for all the parental investment in his schooling, turned out to be a dunce, one indeed so dim-witted that, as an advocate of homeopathy, believed water possessed (like himself) a selective memory, Piers prospered academically, with a First-Class Honours degree in physics at Imperial College London, and then an MSc. in astrophysics at Queen Mary College London. in 1981. (Amongst those voting with Corbyn junior for parliamentary motions in 2007 and 2010 affirming the magical medicinal properties of pure water were the always faithful Diane Abbott and fellow credulous crackpot, the Tory MP David Tredinnick, who also believed in astrology, and that a full moon can cause internal bleeding. In view of Corbyn's unrivalled succession of electoral failures and his endorsement of proven quack cures, the Corbynista anthem should have been not 'Oh Jeremy Corbyn' but the Jackson Sisters' 'I Believe in Miracles'.)

Unlike most scientists with his background who took an interest in the subject, Corbyn senior became an outspoken and much sought-after opponent of the claim that global warming, in part at least, is caused by human activity, a stance on his part no better founded than his brother's belief in the cerebral powers of water. In 1995, Piers founded his own company, Weather Action, specialising in long-term weather forecasting. While his views on global warming aligned him with large-scale corporations and politicians of the right, who saw proposals to reduce carbon emissions as an anti-capitalist conspiracy, his early political commitment was, like his younger brother's, to the left, but to Trotskyism rather than Stalinism. In his student years, he became an activist for the now defunct 'Pabloite' International Marxist Group before moving on to the Labour Party in the 1980s. He then left the party in 2002, only to re-join it after his brother's election as Labour Leader in 2015. Opposed, like his brother, to the EU, he was active in the Brexit referendum campaign, while at the same time giving his endorsement, for what it was worth, to Donald's Trump's bid for the US Presidency. The reader will legitimately object – what has any of this to do with Jeremy Corbyn? The sins of his brother, such as they are, can no more be visited on Jeremy than can those of his forebears. Correct. But what follows can.

In response to the global protests staged to coincide with the inauguration ceremony of Trump as US President, Corbyn senior recycled a tweet from a certain 'WhiteKnight0011' describing himself as a 'White National Socialist': 'They will force Trump in to war. What do you think happened to Hitler? Bilderberg CIA IMF Banker Gangsters'. The tweet endorsed by Piers Corbyn was accompanied by images of two Jews who were alleged to control the world, Lord Jacob Rothschild and the then Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. (As we shall see, the misdeeds of the Rothschilds and Netanyahu proliferate on Corbynista websites)

Although never disowned by his brother, and in fact on occasion defended by him (he told the *Sun* in 2016 that ‘*actually we fundamentally agree*’, Corbyn senior had form as an anti-Semite, having tweeted that 9/11 and ISIS were both the work of the Jews. Now we get to it. When in 2016 the Jewish Labour MP Louise Ellman complained of Corbynista anti-Semitic threats, Piers tweeted: ‘Absurd! JC [Jeremy Corbyn] and all Corbyns are committed anti-Nazis. [Why then recycle Nazi anti-Semitic tweets?] Zionists can’t cope with anyone supporting rights for Palestine’. *To which brother Jeremy tweeted*: ‘He’s not wrong’. In fact it was lie, at least so far as Piers himself was concerned. Regarding Piers’ Nazi re-tweet, Joe Glasman of the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism commented that ‘Jeremy Corbyn’s endorsed his brother’s views last time he alleged there was a Jewish conspiracy. We don’t expect Jeremy will expel him from the party now, after all, re-tweeting Jewish conspiracies is perfectly normal in the Labour Party of today. Maybe he’ll give him a peerage.’

In his role of all-purpose useful idiot, among the positions Corbyn held was that of Patron of the Palestine Solidity Campaign, which several diligent investigations revealed to be inundated with anti-Semites and Neo-Nazis. (See Appendix T) One such in the latter category was Reading PSC activist Tony Gratrex. One of Gratrex’s postings claimed the Jews caused the first and second world wars, and then framed-up the Nazis at the Nuremberg Trials for a Holocaust that never happened. In another, he promoted, with a none too subtle allusion to the notorious anti-Semitic concoction, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. On the same website he could be seen, on two separate occasions, posing for the camera next to Corbyn. Both are smiling. Perhaps the most revealing and damning recruit to the Corbyn camp was the notorious Jewish conspiracy theorist, former Ku Klux Klan Grand Wizard David Duke, Hitler admirer, anti-Zionist, Trump supporter and founder of the white supremacist National Association for the Advancement of White People. A small sample of Duke’s prolific racist rantings will have to suffice, but they provide more than a hint of his political pedigree. *Mein Kampf* was ‘the greatest piece of literature of the 20th century’, while its author was ‘one of the great men of history’. And, on a subject very much after Corbyn’s heart, in an interview on Press TV (the same Iranian channel that featured both Livingstone and Corbyn as highly-paid presenters), the US Congress is ‘totally in the hands of the Zionists. The Zionists control the American government lock, stock and barrel.’ In a radio interview conducted by Duke just after Corbyn had been elected as Labour Leader, Jewish conspiracy theorist James Thring, a speaker at an anti-Israel meeting hosted by Corbyn at Westminster in 2014, at the beginning of the interview, introduced himself as ‘a long-standing friend’ of the newly-elected Labour Leader, and then described how

...people like Jeremy and me are coming together over the Zionist and Jewish power...he doesn’t mention Jewish power actually, but you know, it’s obviously behind his mind...I think it’s quite clear from people like Jeremy and some of the people he’s chosen for his [shadow] cabinet, like John McDonnell and people in the [House of] Lords as well [that] they do know who is really running the country and they are itching both for an opportunity to make it known to the public and to do something about it. [Duke responds]:

We must keep looking for sunshine and I do believe we are going to find sunshine in this world. I think things are opening up.... I know you are a friend of Mr. Corbyn and I knew that you respect his positions on the Middle East. It’s a really good kind

of evolutionary thing isn't it when people are beginning to recognise Zionist power and ultimately the Jewish establishment power in Britain and in the Western world isn't it?

Further endorsement for Corbyn came on August 23, 2018, when he vowed to challenge 'the stranglehold of elite power and billionaire domination over large parts of our media.' Duke immediately tweeted, 'he's right you know'. The same day, a video emerged of Corbyn making a speech in 2013 in which he claimed British Zionists (sic) 'don't understand English irony', adding, without specifying what they were, 'they needed two lessons [sic], which we [sic] could perhaps help them with.' In response to this story, another Neo-Nazi, Nick Griffin, who had previously announced that he would vote Labour because of Corbyn's opposition to UK military action against chemical weapons plants in Syria (President Assad had played host to both himself, three times, and Corbyn) tweeted, 'Go Jezza! [!!!!] I wonder how many Labour activists the hysterical Zionist media campaign against Corbyn is repelling?'

Griffin also shared with 'Jezza' the same warm feelings towards Hezbollah, the now outlawed in the UK Lebanon-based and Syrian and Iranian-sponsored terror organisation dedicated to the elimination of the state of Israel. Corbyn had described the movement, together with Hamas, as his 'friends' and had featured as a speaker at the terrorist movement's annual anti-Israel 'Quds Day' rallies in London. Corbyn had also played host at Westminster to a guest speaker from Hezbollah. For his part, in March 2019, Griffin was a member of a far-right EU Parliamentary delegation which met with Hezbollah leaders in Beirut, endorsing a statement that expressed support for Hezbollah's 'fight against Israel, terrorism [sic] and imperialism.' Of Griffin, Corbyn had said, 'no-one should share a platform with an avowed racist', even though, according to Diane Abbott and his own admission, he had done this on numerous occasions with fellow anti-Zionists. So why not the no less anti-Zionist Griffin? Platforms aside, as the above citations prove beyond any doubt, there were policies that the Labour Leader did share with the Holocaust-denying Griffin, not least their abiding hostility to Israel and their solidarity with those bent on destroying it.

Another Holocaust denier and Hitler apologist, the historian David Irving, gave his judgement on Corbyn during an interview with the *Guardian* of January 14, 2017. Observing that the Labour party was 'tearing itself apart' with 'allegations about anti-Semitism', he went on to say that Corbyn 'seems a very fine man...I'm impressed by him'. This was in marked contrast to Irving's opinion of the Jews, as expressed in his article entitled *Hitler Lays it on the Line* that he published in his journal *Focal Point*, dated May 31, 1983:

In our political life, the Jews are unquestionably obnoxious. They are methodically poisoning our people. I always used to regard anti-Semitism as inhuman but now my own experiences have converted me into the most fanatical enemy of Jewry...A solution [sic] to the Jewish problem must come. If the problem can be solved by common sense, then so much the better for both parties. If not then there are two possibilities: either a bloody conflict or an Arminianisation. [A reference to the Turkish genocide of more than one million Armenians during the First World War.]

In addition to Duke and Irving, Corbyn's stance on matters Jewish attracted support from two other far right sources, both in the USA. The Neo-Nazi website, *Daily*

Stormer (after the Jew-baiting Nazi weekly *Der Sturmer*) and the white supremacist *Occidental Observer*, announced that they were both backing Corbyn in the general election of June 2017. As *Stormer* publisher Andrew Anglim put it, Corbyn 'is genuinely against Israel' and 'seriously anti-Jew'. Similar sentiments spilled out during the election campaign itself in a giant poster displayed by Momentum in Bristol. On the left was a huge picture of Corbyn, and facing him on the right was an equally large one of Tory PM Theresa May. Hanging from her left ear was a star of David earring and above, in large letters, the word 'Balfour', an obvious reference to the Balfour Declaration of November 1917, which stated;

His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country.

The message of the poster was therefore clear. A vote for the Tories was a vote for the Jews and Israel. A vote for Corbyn was vote against the Jews and Israel, and for the Palestinians. And also against the Balfour Declaration itself, as became evident when Corbyn declined an invitation to attend a dinner celebrating its 100th anniversary in November 2017, a clear signal that he did not recognise the legitimacy of the state of Israel, and one that was understood as such by his genocidal 'friends' of Hamas, who issued a statement saying: 'Corbyn says no to dinner on celebrating the Balfour 100 in UK. UK should apologise and compensate Palestinians.' Two months previously, Corbyn had also turned down the customary invitation to attend the Labour Friends of Israel reception at the Brighton party conference, claiming he was too busy preparing a speech. This proved to be a lie, as he was seen that same evening whooping it up at the *Daily Mirror's* annual conference bash. Never before in living memory had a Labour Leader rejected this invitation. And there was more. Labour Party members conversant with Corbyn's attitude towards Israel, and his collaboration with those who sought its destruction and the extermination of its entire Jewish population, should surely have asked themselves; was it by accident that Corbyn should have chosen to participate in the launching of an 'Islamophobia Awareness Month' in the same week as supporters of Israel were commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration? And was it also by chance that of the several organisations that campaign in this area, Corbyn should have chosen to join forces in the promotion of this 'month' with one which was notorious for its hostility towards Zionism? Sufyan Golam, Executive Officer of the group in question, MEND, (Muslim Engagement and Development) had previously used a sermon in a Manchester mosque to launch into an attack on Tell MAMA, another organisation in the same business of combatting what it regarded as Islamophobia, but had not been invited to the launch: 'We don't want the Government to fob us off with some phoney thing called Tell MAMA, which has got a pretty much pro-Zionist heading it, or in a very senior capacity, and is making comments we might not agree with when it comes to homosexuality, to be recording Islamophobia.'

Corbyn's choice of campaign partners suggested he agreed. In addition to deviating from Sharia law in not being homophobic, (the punishment for being gay

is death) one of Tell MAMA's besetting sins was that it had sought from and been given advice by the Jewish Community Security Trust...surely the kiss of death. With good reason then that Jennifer Gerber, Director of Labour Friends of Israel, told the *Jewish Chronicle* it was 'utterly unacceptable' that Corbyn 'should choose to attend an event organised by a group which has repeatedly peddled myths about the power of the "Israeli lobby" that play into classic anti-Semitic tropes'. This judgment was borne out by an investigation into MEND by the Henry Jackson Society, the cross-partisan 'think tank', which described the group as 'Islamists masquerading as civil libertarians' who 'regularly hosted illiberal, intolerant and extremist Islamist speakers at public events.' Amongst its staff and activists were 'those who have promoted conspiracy theories, anti-Semitism and intolerance of other Muslim minority denominations'. Evidently unconcerned by these unsavoury associations, a former Tory government minister, the Muslim Baroness Warsi and, inevitably, the ubiquitous Jeremy Corbyn, appeared in a promotional video on MEND's Twitter page, proving that as on so many similar previous and subsequent occasions, anti-Zionism can be thicker than party. This was the kind of company Corbyn preferred to keep, rather than with Jews celebrating the realisation of the Zionist dream.

This was not the first time Corbyn had declined to associate himself with an historic Jewish event. In 2016, he was invited by his opposite number, the leader of the Israeli Labour Party, Isaac Herzog, to visit the Yad Veshem Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem. Herzog had been 'appalled' by Livingstone's claim that the policy of Hitler in 1932 was 'that the Jews should be moved to Israel'. Following Livingstone's suspension, Herzog issued his invitation to Corbyn 'to witness that the last time Jews were forcibly transported it was not to Israel [which, as Livingstone must have known, did not then exist] but to their deaths'. After several weeks' delay, Corbyn declined the invitation, claiming he was too busy, offering to send party General Secretary Ian McNichol or Chairman Tom Watson instead. Too busy? But Corbyn was rarely if ever too busy to front up anti-Zionist rallies alongside his Jihadi 'friends' or take freebies as a guest of Jew-killing terrorists and anti-Semitic despots. It was not too hard to divine the probable real motive for Corbyn's declining the Israeli Labour Party's invitation. Imagine the reaction of these 'friends' if Comrade Jeremy had been a guest of a Jewish socialist in, of all places, Jerusalem, bearing witness to a crime that in their estimation, either never happened, or if it did, was a cause for celebration?

During his campaign for the Labour leadership, Corbyn, having said he wanted 'a kinder politics', understandably came under considerable pressure to disavow his long-standing associations with anything but kind avowed anti-Semites, Jihadis, Iranian theocrats and Holocaust and 9/11 deniers. Despite equivocations and convenient memory lapses, it became obvious that Corbyn was not prepared to do so. Even when he attended, *pro forma*, a 'fringe' meeting of the Labour Friends of Israel at the September 2015 Labour party conference, in a speech lasting eight minutes on the subject of Israeli-Palestinian relations, he could not bring himself to utter once the word 'Israel', not even when challenged to do so by a member of the audience. Amongst the company Corbyn had kept, Israel was for his Jihadi friends a taboo word, 'Zionist entity' being the standard term for the state that must be destroyed. So, without saying the forbidden word, he still somehow contrived to condemn Israel for its 'siege of Gaza', while having no words of criticism for Hamas's kidnappings, renewed tunnelling and rocket attacks.

For how long Corbyn would be able to continue serving as the Sharia left's useful idiot was the big question. Now that he wore Labour's crown, would the former Sharia Prince Hal remain true to his Jihadi John Falstaffs? His pusillanimous response to the Paris massacres of November 13 2015, which earned him the epithet 'fucking disgrace' from a former Labour Minister, suggested that he would. Then in March 2016, a report appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* of his close links with Mohammed Kozbar, Chairman of the Finsbury Park Mosque. This jewel in the crown of UK Islam was opened by its Patron, the then (Islamophile) Prince Charles, in 1994, and its construction funded by King Fahd of Saudi Arabia. It was also notorious for its celebration of the first anniversary of 9/11, and as a breeding ground for 'home grown' recruits to the Islamic State. Kozbar, who was on record as calling for the destruction of Israel and had engaged in fund raising for Hamas, was shown at a mosque function in July 2015 shaking hands with Corbyn in front of the logo of the Muslim Brotherhood-affiliated Muslim Association of Britain, together with a Corbyn tweet which read: 'With Mohammed Kozbar at the Finsbury Park Mosque Itfar supper and thanked them for being a superb [sic] community.'

Also pointing in the same direction was Corbyn's appointment of two former associates of the WRP, co-editors of the PLO, Gaddafi and Saddam-subsidised *Labour Herald*: Ken Livingstone, as co-chairman of the Labour Party's defence review, and John McDonnell, back in the 1980s Livingstone's deputy leader of the GLC, as shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer. Both were very public opponents of the existence of the state of Israel. Within hours of his appointment, Livingstone was advising a critic that he 'might need some psychiatric help', just one of many instances of Corbyn's 'kinder politics'. Then in April 2016 came the bombshell and body blow to Corbyn of the suspension of his closest ally on a charge of anti-Semitism. For Livingstone watchers such as myself, it was hardly a surprise, since he had never disguised his venomous feelings about Israel, whose creation he regarded as 'a disaster', and of the ideals that created and sustain it, which he had likened to Nazism. His views on the fate of the Jews in Nazi Germany were likewise coloured by his visceral anti-Zionism, even claiming on Irish state radio in August 1983 that English rule in Ireland had been more destructive than the Holocaust. In the event, the remarks that triggered his suspension were the claim that until his last years, Hitler was a 'supporter of Zionism', and another, made in defence of Muslim Labour MP for Bradford West Naz Shah, adviser to Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell. Shah had proposed as a 'solution [sic] to [the] Israel-Palestine conflict' that all of Israel's six million Jews should be, quote, 'relocated' to the United States, and on another occasion, had advised readers of her website to 'never forget' that 'everything that Hitler did in Germany was legal' (See appendix III). Against Corbyn's wishes, Labour's National Executive Committee immediately suspended her. Shah was also defended against charges of anti-Semitism by fellow Muslim MP Rupa Huq, who subsequently was accused by a Jewish staffer of anti-Semitism, while Corbyn's most senior adviser, Seumas Milne, claimed that when Livingstone described Hitler as a supporter of Zionism, he 'had a point'.

If we combine what Shah, Milne and Livingstone each say about Hitler, what emerges is a picture of a successful, law-abiding German politician who, until, according to Livingstone, he 'went mad and ended up killing six million Jews' and therefore, being insane, became no longer legally or morally responsible for his actions, went out of his way to help the Jews realise their dream of returning to the Holy Land. Livingstone would have been well-advised to check his sources before

sounding off about Hitler and the Jews. For example, his assertion that Hitler 'won his [sic] election in 1932' is wrong. Hitler and his party contested not one, but four national elections in 1932, and in each of them failed to win anything like a majority of the votes cast. The first two were for the post of President. In the first round, on March 13, Hitler secured 30.1% of the votes cast. In the run-off on April 10, when he collected extra votes from voters who had backed right wing candidates eliminated after the first round, Hitler's share of the vote was 36.8%. The last two were elections to the Reichstag. On July 31, the Nazi Party's share of the votes was 37.27%, their largest in a free election, and on November 6, 33.09%, less by some margin than the vote for the two left parties, the Communists and the Social Democrats with 37.29%

'Hitler supported Zionism'? Also, wrong. In his *Mein Kampf* (1925) he predicted that a 'Jewish state in Palestine' would serve as a 'central organisation for their international world swindle'. Supported Zionism? Of the half a million Jews living in Germany at the time of the Nazi take-over, by the outbreak of the war, 252,000, after being stripped of their money and possessions, had been allowed to emigrate. Of that total, only 33,390 finally managed to reach what was at the time the British Mandate. Nearly all the Jews left behind in Germany perished in Hitler's 'Final Solution'. As for going mad, wrong yet again. In an exhaustive survey of all the available medical evidence, the Nazi-era specialist Richard Evans concluded that right up to his suicide in a Berlin bunker on April 30, 1945, Hitler, 'certainly was not mentally ill, not at least in in any sense known to medicine or psychiatry.' But Livingstone, perhaps privy to facts that Evans either had no access to or had overlooked, knew better.

Livingstone, Milne and Shah would no doubt place themselves on the left of the Labour Party. Yet their unorthodox, to say the least, slants on the history of the Third Reich overlapped with two historical schools at other end of the same political spectrum, both of which have been attacked, and rightly so, as essentially apologists for Hitler. The first is that established by the post-war German historian Ernst Nolte who, while not as categorical in his claims as Shah, argued that most of Hitler's actions were legal, while those that were not were justified by necessity. Further to the right again we have David Irving whom, as we have seen, was rather taken with fellow anti-Semite Jeremy. Although usually identified as belonging to the Holocaust denial camp, he had always insisted this designation was false, and in fact brought a libel action, which he famously lost, in an attempt to prove it. What Irving did say is that in so far as the Jews were persecuted, Hitler, pre-occupied with military matters, did his best to protect them, but 'had the wool pulled over his eyes' by his SS chief Heinrich Himmler, who was bent on their destruction. In Irving's words, Hitler 'was the best friend the Jews ever had', which, assumedly, quoting now Livingstone, would include 'supporting Zionism'.

Predictably, it was Livingstone who sprang to Shah's defence when she was suspended from the Labour Party for anti-Semitism. Although conceding that her comments were 'over the top', he insisted they were not anti-Semitic, only 'offensive'. All Shah's comment amounted to was 'a bit [sic] of criticism of Israel and Israel supporters.' And he went further, claiming 'in 47 years I have never heard anyone say anything anti-Semitic'. But then, that depends on one's definition of anti-Semitism. Livingston had said it was 'not the same things as racism', any more than hating all the Jews of Israel was anti-Semitic, this being therefore not one, but two stages removed from racism. Livingstone had the usual explanation for why

he had been targeted as an anti-Semite. There had been ‘a well-orchestrated campaign by the Israel [for which read ‘Jewish’] lobby to smear anyone who criticises Israel as anti-Semitic.’ As we have seen, this ‘anyone’ included not only Livingstone, who opposed the existence of Israel, but neo-Nazis and Muslim Jihadis, who advocated its obliteration, together with its seven million Jews. Were they too being ‘smeared’?

The Socialist Workers Party naturally rushed to the defence of the two traduced anti-Zionists: ‘Shah is not anti-Semitic, and neither is Livingstone.’ And if judged by the SWP’s also somewhat lax standards on this issue, they perhaps had a point. The online *Socialist Worker* of April 29, 2016 explained that ‘anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism are not the same thing’, yet like Livingstone, failed to offer its own definition of anti-Semitism to establish this distinction. Instead, the reader was presented with one of Zionism that was itself anti-Jewish and, moreover, was shared by Corbyn: ‘Zionism is based on the idea that Jewish people cannot live peacefully alongside non-Jewish people and that Israel should be an exclusively Jewish state.’ The ignoramus who wrote this, like so many other professional anti-Zionists, was either obviously unaware of, or chose to ignore the fact that in the ‘exclusively Jewish’ state of Israel, more than two million Arab citizens lived, not ‘alongside’, but *in* Israel on equal terms, peacefully, with Israel’s seven million Jews. It was not Zionist Jews, but Hamas and Hezbollah, the two terrorist, anti-Semitic movements supported by the SWP, that had refused to live peacefully ‘alongside’ Israel, who had rejected the ‘two-state solution’ agreed by Israel and the PLO in Oslo in 1993, choosing instead to seek its destruction and the extermination of its Jewish population. The SWP had never able to cite one single passage from any authoritative Zionist text which expressed in any form the idea that ‘Jewish people cannot live alongside non-Jewish people’. On the contrary, the founder of modern Zionism, Theodore Herzl, from the beginning, made it clear, over and again, that the opposite was the case, and that the need for a Jewish state was the response to the fact that the rise across Europe of organised anti-Semitism demonstrated that increasing numbers of gentiles *did not want to live peacefully alongside Jews*, a conclusion tragically vindicated by the Nazi Holocaust:

We have sincerely tried everywhere to merge with the national communities in which we live, seeking only to preserve the faith of our fathers. [Like many Zionist leaders, Herzl was himself an atheist] It is not permitted us. In vain we are loyal patriots [as indeed was Captain Dreyfus] sometimes super loyal...[yet] in our native lands where we have lived for centuries, we are still decried as aliens.

The Jewish state he envisaged in what was still then Ottoman territory would be ‘founded on the ideas which are the common product of all civilised nations...It would be immoral if we were to exclude anyone, whatever his origin, whatever his descent...our motto must be now and forever; “Man, you are my brother”.’ Numerous other texts from the various stages in the evolution of the Zionist movement both before and after the creation of the state of Israel in 1948 each expressed in different ways the same principle. And there are also texts by anti-Semites that have asserted the contrary, that non-Jews, be they German Nazis or Arab anti-Zionists, cannot and should not live in peace alongside Jews.

Livingstone’s claim that until the last years of the Third Reich, when he supposedly ‘went mad’ and turned against the Jews, Hitler was a ‘supporter of

Zionism', can be construed in one of two ways. For some it can, and indeed has been seen as attempt to whitewash Hitler, to depict the pre-Holocaust dictator in a favourable light, as someone who until in his last years when he lost his sanity, was trying to help the Jews rather than exterminate them. As already cited, this was the claim of David Irving. Others will see in Livingstone's historical fictions confirmation that the Zionists conspired with the Nazis to create a Jewish state in the homeland of the Palestinians. I have good reasons to believe that this was what Livingstone intended. But this interpretation has its own complications for Muslim admirers of Hitler like Luton Labour councillor Gurbuz, who praised 'her man' as the friend, not of the Jews, but of the Palestinians. (She was correct. See Chapter 6)

When appearing at his hearing on charges of anti-Semitism, Livingstone should surely have been asked, with regard to comments by party members that had led to their suspension or expulsion: 'If these statements, all made by Labour Party members, do not in your judgement qualify as anti-Semitic, what does?' Naz Shah's was a particularly interesting example of how Muslim anti-Semitism had eaten its way into the very heart of the Labour Party. Herself an adviser to Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell, who was himself an avowed opponent of the existence of a Jewish state in the Middle East, not even one, as he put it, no larger than, quote, 'a postage stamp', she in turn employed as her Parliamentary aide a fellow anti-Semite, Bradford Labour Councillor Mohammed Shabbir, who had claimed that the Jews of Israel were responsible for 'a Palestinian Holocaust in Gaza'. (Under Israeli rule, Gaza's population had risen by 400%) There are good grounds for suspecting that Shah, who had made no less vile accusations against Israel, would not have seen such opinions as obstacles to the employment of his services.

Though united in its hostility toward mainstream 'Blairite' Labour, relations on Labour's far left were not always comradely. Displaying the kind of loathing unique to religious and political factions contesting the same ideological turf, sundry neo-Trotskyist cliques took time out from cursing Zionist Nazis and Blairite traitors to call out and hunt down traitors within their own ranks. One faction singled out for this treatment was the Alliance for Workers Liberty, notorious on the far left for its unorthodox stance on Israel, which it believed should be allowed to exist, its opposition to the Argentinean junta's invasion of the Falklands and to Serbian 'ethnic cleansing' in Bosnia, Kosovo and Croatia. This maverick grouplet of no more than one hundred members, some of whom I knew and respected, was described by one Corbyn loyalist as a 'wrecking operation designed to undermine the political Left in Britain'. But behind the AWL stood even more sinister forces: 'There are well-founded rumours that they receive funds from Israeli lobbyists. They have been planted [sic] in the labour movement to disrupt and divide.' The Jewish Conspiracy strikes yet again, this time in the guise of a neo-Trotskyist sect.

Then there was Momentum, not a leftist sect, but an unstable alliance of sundry far-leftist groupings, student activists and party members of an older vintage going back to the years of the Bennite ascendancy. These substantial, if disparate forces succeeded in bringing under their control a considerable number of Labour Party constituency organisations, and so were able to elect their own delegates to the party's annual national conference, thereby providing majorities for Corbyn's various policy initiatives. However, in the PLP, Corbyn could count on at the most, thirty or so MPs of a total of 232. Given this divergence, it was inevitable that tensions over Corbyn's foreign policy, for want of a better

term, emerged soon after Corbyn's victory. Following a succession of Jihadi atrocities in 2015, beginning with the downing of a Russian passenger jet on October 31, and continuing with the Paris and Beirut massacres of November 13 and a week later, the assault on the Mali Radisson Blu Hotel in Bamako, on November 20, the 15 member United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution which declared the Islamic State to be 'a global and unprecedented threat to international peace and security' and 'call[ed] upon member states that have the capacity to do so to take all necessary measures on the territory under the control of ISIUL [the Islamic State] in Syria and Iraq'. This was the long overdue blank cheque from the UN for those who could, and wished to, to invade and destroy the Islamic State. If acted upon seriously, as the French, who proposed the motion, appeared to intend, it could have compelled Obama to abandon his disastrous strategy of 'containment'.

Corbyn's opposition to any military action against the Islamic State and, even after the Paris massacre, rejection of armed responses to its assassins in the diaspora, now found him not only in direct conflict with the UN and public opinion, but with most Labour MPs and even with some members of his handpicked Shadow Cabinet, precipitating a series of resignations that lead to a challenge, albeit unsuccessful, to his leadership some months later. And no wonder. What a humiliating spectacle. Within weeks of his election as Labour's Leader, the first test of his much-vaunted internationalism found him refusing to lift a token finger in solidarity with the embattled Socialist government of France. His pretext was that joining with other European nations in the fight back against the Islamic State would put British servicemen 'in harm's way', as if this was somehow outside their job description, while 'the loss of civilian lives' was 'sadly [sic] almost inevitable', as indeed it also was when the Allies conducted military operations against Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan in the Second World War. And meantime, as the Islamic State continued to deliberately slaughter 'civilians' by the thousand, Corbyn was advising the USA and France to cease their attacks on the Islamic State and instead 'put their efforts into a peace process', presumably with this same Islamic State. With his usual impeccable timing, on the same day that Corbyn declared himself in favour of a 'back channel' approach to the Islamic State, it was reported from the east Syrian city of Deir-ez Zor that ISIS Jihadis had slaughtered in one day at least 800 of its (civilian) inhabitants and abducted another 400. Yet not military action, but 'a negotiated settlement' was the course recommended by this later day Chamberlain to bring such atrocities to an end. A negotiated 'peace process' with the Islamic State? Yes, said Corbyn. 'There has to be some route through somewhere'. But even the gullible and dim-witted Chamberlain realised in the end that appeasement of fascism simply stimulated its appetites.

Corbyn's attitude to military action, whatever its motive, resembled most closely that of one of his predecessors, George Lansbury, who became Labour Leader in 1932, the year after the defection of Labour's first Prime Minister, Ramsey MacDonald, to a National Government coalition with the Tories and some Liberals. As an avowed pacifist, Lansbury believed that Britain should set an example to the world by divesting itself of its means of defence: 'I would close every recruiting station, disband the army and disarm the Air Force. I would abolish the whole dreadful equipment of war and say to the world, "do your worst"'. Which is exactly what Hitler did six years later. At the Labour Party's annual conference of 1935, held in October on the eve of Mussolini's invasion of Abyssinia, Lansbury

made a speech opposing his own Party Executive's support for League of Nations sanctions against Fascist Italy for its unprovoked attack on one of the League's member states, a scenario not unlike that which confronted the UN in March 2022 following Putin's invasion of one its member states, even to the extent of Corbyn emulating Lansbury by opposing sanctions on Russia and opposing western military aid to the embattled Ukrainians.

Lansbury's opposition to sanctions on Italy was decisively rebuffed by the trade union leader and, from 1945 to 1951, Labour Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, who famously derided Lansbury for 'hawking your conscience from body to body asking to be told what to do with it'. Days afterwards, with the fascist dictators arming themselves for a new world war, Lansbury resigned, and was replaced by Clement Attlee, who returned Labour to a policy of national defence and subsequently, opposed Tory appeasement of Hitler. Lansbury however continued in his Corbynesque quest for a world without war by seeking disarmament agreements with dictators who were busily and quite openly preparing to launch another one. In April 1937, he was granted a private audience with Hitler, followed by another with Mussolini. In October 1938, Lansbury, quite logically from his pacifist standpoint, welcomed the Munich agreement that handed over to Hitler the Czech Sudentland. (Corbyn, again in his role as latter-day Lansbury, without specifically endorsing Putin's illegal annexation of the Crimea in 2014, depicted it in the Muscovite *Morning Star* as a defensive response to threats against an encircled Russia coming from the West - see Appendix XIV.)

If a pacifist, in a purely private capacity, chooses to proffer his or her cheeks to the first thug that comes along and tries to persuade others to do the same and, in doing so, only puts at risk their own life and liberty, that is their own affair. However, it is an entirely different matter when the same pacifist, but now in a position of political authority, as Lansbury was then, and Corbyn, although he rejects that label, was from 2015 to 2020, seeks to make the same choice on behalf of others by denying to them the means to defend themselves. Self-defence was without any doubt the wish of the vast majority of the public in Lansbury's time as Labour Leader, just as it was in Corbyn's. Few, apart from pacifists, Leninists and pro-Jihadi Muslims, will disagree with the proposition that the first duty of any UK government, be it left or right, is to protect the country's territorial integrity, democracy, freedoms and security from attack, whether internally from terrorism, or externally, from conventional military threats. Lansbury did not think so, and rightly paid the political penalty. Neither did Corbyn, but in his case, he was rewarded by being elected twice to the leadership of the Labour Party, ironically with the assistance of some of the present-day successors to Ernest Bevin.

Let us be clear about what was Corbyn's stance on the defence of the UK. When asked at a party leadership hustling by his opponent Owen Smith whether, if required to do so, he would honour Clause Five of the Washington Treaty, which obligates all NATO member states to come to the assistance of any member that is attacked, Corbyn declined to answer. Instead of giving an honest statement of his position, as Lansbury did in refusing to endorse a similar commitment to League of Nations sanctions against Mussolini, he offered a sanctimonious platitude that could also just as easily come from the lips of Lansbury: 'I don't wish to go to war. What I want to do is achieve a world where we don't need to go to war.' No sane and decent person would *wish* to go to war. But wishing is not the issue. There are occasions, as for example when there is a straight choice between submitting to tyranny and

resisting it, a sane and freedom-loving person would accept that fighting back, or as Corbyn calls, it 'going to war', is the only option, as it was when on February 24, 2022, Ukraine resisted Putin's invasion, and on October 9, 2023, when Israel's resisted an invasion by Hamas. On both occasions, this resistance was not supported by Corbyn, as it would not have been by Lansbury. For those like Lansbury and Corbyn, who value 'peace' above all else, war must be avoided at all costs, including those of democracy and freedom.

Pacifists make much of their belief in the 'sanctity of life' and regale those who are not convinced by their arguments with homilies on 'the futility of war', for example the wars that defeated Hitler, put an end to slavery in the USA, removed the fascist Saddam regime in Iraq, and repelled the five Arab armies who invaded Israel at its birth in 1948. The reality is that so long as the entire world's population does not share its absolute rejection of violence, pacifism, far from being a means of preserving life, will more resemble a death cult. No-one has demolished the case for pacifism better than Sam Harris:

While it can seem noble enough when the stakes are low, pacifism is nothing more than a willingness to die, and to let others die, at the pleasure of the world's thugs. It should be enough to note that a single sociopath, armed with nothing more than a knife, could exterminate a city full of pacifists.

'A willingness to die' is exactly what Gandhi recommended to the Jews of Europe as the Nazis herded them into the gas chambers of the Third Reich. A 'general massacre of the Jews' was not only to be preferred to any active resistance, such as took place at Sobibor and a number of other death camps. Extermination at the hands of the Nazis would be 'a day of thanksgiving and joy that Jehovah had wrought deliverance of the race even at the hands of the tyrant'. It was in the same spirit that after the fall of France in June 1940, and with the UK faced with the threat of a Nazi invasion, Gandhi chose that very moment to call on the British, *but not the Germans*, to lay down their arms, the same policy that Corbyn advocated consistently throughout his more than four decades of membership of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. His substitute for a defence policy did not impress voters, not least his laughable attempt to appease trade union leaders whose members' jobs depended on the up-dating of the Trident fleet, by agreeing to spend tax payer's money on the construction of new nuclear submarines on the condition that they carried no nuclear weapons. So why not go the whole pacifist hog and have guns with no bullets or warships and tanks with no means of propulsion, and planes with no wings?

Who exactly were the Corbynistas, especially those dream-world idealists who rejected the need and right of their country to defend itself, but in many cases, if their online missives were any guide, supported the right of Jihadis to kill civilian Israeli Jews? A 2016 study revealed that of those who evinced an interest in politics, the younger the age group, the higher the value that its cohort placed on extra-parliamentary activities such as protest meetings, 'flash mobs', demonstrations, publicity seeking-stunts, and interaction via social media and the like, whereas voting was rated the lowest. As was all too evident from the chants at meetings and the slogans displayed on banners, posters and even T-shirts, their first loyalty, one that was totally uncritical and akin in its naivety and fervour to religious devotion, was to Saint Jeremy, and not the party founded by British trade unionists to provide

a political voice for the working class in Parliament. Parliament, a nest of traitors, was not the arena of the real action, but on the street, in a mass meeting or at a pop concert addressed by the Supreme Leader, where the faithful hung on his every (invariably banal) word as if it were gospel, or at a hustling where doubters and dissenters were booed, heckled and insulted, and on-line, where traitor MPs could be anonymously bombarded with anti-Semitic slurs and death and even rape threats. (See Appendix T)

This preference among the young for ‘direct action’, and rejection of what was seen as ‘establishment’ politics had over the decades created a fertile if transitory source of recruitment for the far left. Reared in the elitist tradition of Lenin, popularity with the broader public was always regarded by its cadres as a secondary concern, the prime objective being the creation or, by means of an entry operation such as Momentum, the capture of a political machine. This machine, staffed by a team of disciplined professional political activists, those whom Lenin termed as the ‘vanguard’, would then, at the appropriate moment, and armed with political insights, strategy and tactics beyond the comprehension of the untutored masses, place itself at the head of movements that could be harnessed for the overthrow of the bourgeois order. Such had been the far leftist dream since the Bolshevik coup of November 1917, that what Lenin achieved in semi-Asiatic, backward Russia could and one day, would be accomplished in the countries of the advanced, democratic west, guided by an avowedly revolutionary party modelled on Lenin’s Bolsheviks. That remained the case until a connected series of fundamental economic and social changes in western capitalist countries compelled a drastic change in strategy, with one of its consequences being the emergence and rise of what I have called Sharia leftism. (See Chapter 13) In every variant, the key question was always, how to either confront, or influence, if not control, the Labour Party.

The classic exponents of the entryist version of this strategy were of course the so-called Militant Tendency, the remnants of which, after a series of splits and expulsions from the Labour Party, remerged in their new guise of the Socialist Party under the leadership of the veteran Trotskyist Peter Taaffe. Replying to entirely justified accusations that Momentum was being manipulated, at least in part, by Trotskyist entryists, Taaffe revealed he had already sounded out Corbyn as to the possibility of lifting of the ban imposed on groups such as his own, who could then be accepted as individual members of the Labour Party. Corbyn, said Taaffe, was ‘a good bloke. He’s principled. He’s on the left.’ (So were Stalin, Pol Pot and Mao.) Taaffe was not the least concerned that the conflict between the Corbynistas and their opponents might lead to a split in the Labour Party: ‘The civil war, now it’s open, cannot be called off.’ He was perfectly sanguine about a Corbynite rump being reduced to as few as 20 MPs. Who needs a majority in Parliament when ‘the lava of revolution was still hot’? That was why ousting the Tories by winning a General Election was the least of the far left’s concerns, as Momentum Chairman Jon Lansman explained: “‘Winning” is the small bit that matters to political elites who want to keep power to themselves’. The ‘political elites’ in question were those 170 or so anti-Corbyn Labour MP elected by the votes of millions and accountable to their constituents, while the self-selecting elite that owned and controlled Momentum directed a party within a party, complete with a constitution, membership subscriptions, offices and full-time staff, all totally contrary to Labour Party rules and with the approval of its leader. Lansman, together with Corbyn’s

Chief of Staff Simon Fletcher, was one of the two directors of the company that legally owned Momentum, 'Momentum Campaign (Services) Ltd'.

Yet for all the far left's genuine and undisguised scorn for conventional political activity and established democratic institutions, entryists have been elected as councillors, Labour MPs, and even, briefly and disastrously, as in Liverpool, captured a majority on a Labour Council. For a number of reasons, among them its rich ethnic mix and large and politically active radical middle class, London Labour was especially vulnerable to a leftist take-over, as the Livingstone experience demonstrated. For all its claims to be 'for the many', half of Corbynised Labour's membership lived in London, far and away the UK's wealthiest city, with a per capita income of £57,000 compared to the UK's £49,000.

With London firmly under Corbynista control, with more chances of success than in the traditional Labour heartlands, the so-called 'red wall' where apart from seats with a large Muslim presence support for Corbyn was spread more thinly, the plan was to secure the adoption of candidates for Parliament or other offices who would toe the Momentum line. It was on this basis that Sadiq Khan, the Muslim Labour MP for Tooting, South London, was adopted as Labour's candidate for Mayor of London by the Sharia left-dominated London Labour Party. Beyond any doubt, the assumption was that as a Muslim, he would be amenable to toeing the Sharia leftist line, one that was reasonable, though, as it proved to his credit, a false one. He became one of Corbyn's harshest critics, not least for his refusal to curb the surge of anti-Semitism in the Labour Party that followed his selection as Leader. After failing in their bid to prevent him addressing the 2017 Labour Party Conference, Momentum delegates took their revenge against Khan by heckling him throughout his speech. A kinder politics. He also did himself no favours with his bigoted fellow Muslims, incurring a death sentence *fatwah* after declaring his support for same-sex marriage, and likewise, also with Corbynistas, by joining the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism, instrumental in launching the EHRC investigation into Labour Party anti-Semitism. In all, as Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan proved himself an exemplar of how Muslims should conduct themselves in public office.

True, there had been times in Khan's legal career when as solicitor, he had become involved in cases and causes that had Jihadist undertones, to say the least. This perhaps explains why, just as was the case with Corbyn, once he became a candidate for London Mayor, his past came under close scrutiny. Unlike with Corbyn, what was revealed was not so much anything detrimental to Khan himself, but rather a glimpse of the Muslim political underworld that swirled around him. When Khan was first elected to Parliament in 2010, the defeated Liberal candidate, Nasser Butt, was also a Muslim, though as a member of the Amadiyyah sect, not recognised as such by Khan's Sunni Muslim supporters in the constituency. So great was the sectarian hatred directed against Butt (though it must be stressed, disowned and condemned by Khan) that for his safety he was advised not to attend a husting (attended by Labour's most prominent London anti-Semite, Ken Livingstone) at Khan's local mosque, the Tooting Islamic Centre. When Mark Clarke, the part-Asian Conservative candidate, arrived, he was mistaken for Butt, and, to save him from a lynching, he had to be locked in a room together with his election agent at the rear of the building.

Members of the Tooting Islamic Centre's congregation were instructed not to vote for Nasser Butt, since he was deemed to be an apostate, the punishment for

which under Sharia law is death. Tooting then became the focal point for a campaign of incitement to murder members of the local Amadiyyah congregation, one which in the very best traditions of Islamic tolerance, included a leaflet in Urdu inviting Sunni Muslims to ‘kill a Qadiyani and the doors to heaven will be open to you.’ This was in Tooting, London, not Lahore, Pakistan. The Tooting Centre’s imam, Shaikh Sulaiman Ghani, notorious for his hatred of the Amadiyyahs, who had shared platforms with Khan on no fewer than nine occasions, tried, unsuccessfully to organise a Muslim boycott of Amadiyyah shopkeepers. He was also billed to share a platform on April 30, 2016 in Dewsbury with other four Muslim speakers and local Labour MP Paula Sherriff, at a Gaza (that is to say, Hamas) fund raising event. Even though it was made clear on its promotional materials that the meeting would be sexually segregated, and ticket applications had to be made separately for men and women, Sherriff only withdrew after protests at her participation in a segregated event.

Why had a Tooting imam agreed to speak with a local Labour MP in support of Hamas in of all places, Dewsbury, a run-down Yorkshire mill town? What possible interest could a Muslim terrorist movement dedicated to annihilating Israel and murdering all its Jews hold for the good citizens of Dewsbury? Let me provide some facts about the town, and then leave it to you, the reader, to decide for yourself what that answer might be. Dewsbury is a small town, population 62,000, but it has, at the latest count, no fewer than 28 mosques, some, including the largest, funded by the Saudi monarchy. The concentration of mainly Sunni Muslims is so dense, in the west of the town more than 50%, that it has been called the Islamic Republic of Dewsbury. In the Savile Town area, the 2011 census revealed that only 4, repeat, four, of its 4033 inhabitants were non-Muslims. So much for ‘diversity’. In Dewsbury, the triumph of anti-integrationist multiculturalism had been so complete that even the lady in the Rossi’s ice cream van wore a burka to protect herself from being raped by her almost exclusively Muslim schoolboy customers. In recent years, after decades of obscurity, Dewsbury has repeatedly been in the news, on each occasion for religious reasons. In 2005, the town provided two of the four Muslim suicide bombers who carried out the 7/7 attack on the London transport system. A Dewsbury born and bred Muslim, the 16-year-old Hammad Munshi, brought more fame to the town when he became the UK’s youngest convicted terrorist. He was arrested while walking home from school carrying two bags of ball bearings. Dewsbury also holds the record for having reared the UK’s youngest ever suicide bomber, Talha Asmil, aged 17, who in June 2015, on an Islamic State mission to murder Shi’a Muslims, blew himself up in Iraq. Then in March 2016, once sleepy Dewsbury yet again featured in the mainstream media when it was revealed that a local *madrassah*, the Islamic Tarbiyah Academy no less, taught an anti-Semitic, Jihadi curriculum to its 140 Muslim pupils. As in Saudi Arabian schools, amongst its teaching materials were those based on the text so often cited and much revered by the Nazis and Hamas, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. ensuring, for such was the intention, that like millions of other young Muslims, the *madrassah*’s brainwashed pupils would grow up believing that they are the victims of a conspiracy by 0.2% of the world’s population to subvert a religion followed by 22%. The founder of the ‘Academy’, Mufti Zabair Dudha, was no small-town preacher. He was the overseer for around half of the UK’s Mosques and *madrassahs*. Thus we have yet another Muslimised, run down, former mill town, plagued with so much violent crime it has been called the ‘town that dare

not speak its name. But it has its brighter side. It boasts an Islamic court, and serves as a kind of Mecca for the UK's faithful. Back in South London, Tooting's Shaikh Ghani made no attempt to conceal his Jihadi convictions, calling publicly on Muslims to establish an Islamic State in the UK, and depicting women as inferior and therefore necessarily 'subservient' to men. He also, again publicly, denounced attempts by UK security agencies to prevent British Muslims travelling to Syria to fight for the Islamic State.

It was no surprise then that when Sadiq Khan's local imam learned the result of the Labour leadership contest, he posted the following message: 'Congratulations to newly elected leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn. Brilliant victory. Things can and will change'. And how. A month later, two Muslim youths were arrested after an arson attack on the Tooting Amadiyyah mosque, followed by the murder of a Glasgow Amadiyyah shopkeeper by a Sunni Muslim after he tweeted Easter greetings to Christians, and within the Labour Party, by a barrage of anti-Semitic comments by Muslim councillors, Momentum activists, a Labour MP and Corbyn's defence adviser and former London Mayor, Ken Livingstone, each representing the key constituent participants in what was to become the Corbynista hijacking of the Labour Party: the old, Benn era left, the student radicals and entryists, and Muslims, with anti-Zionism, in some cases shading into anti-Semitism, as the common denominator.

Just how firm the grip of the Sharia Left on the upper echelons of the Labour Party had become following the election of Corbyn was highlighted by the way its National Executive Committee handled the case of Gerry Downing. Downing was the leader of a tiny Trotskyist group that went by the name of Socialist Fight. He shared with many others on the Sharia left and in the Arab world the belief that 'the Nazis collaborated with the Zionists in transporting Jews to Palestine' and not, as non-Sharia left history tells it, to death and slave camps in Poland. We have already seen how, as an integral part of the Sharia left's obsessional campaigning against Israel, a new, totally inverted history of the Second World War was concocted over the years by those who rallied to the Corbynite leadership of the Labour Party, in which Jews were depicted as allies of the Nazis, and the Arabs as their victims (For the true story, which is the reverse, see Chapter 6) This Sharia left version of Holocaust denial, as featured in Downing's *Socialist Fight* of October 15, 2014, proved no obstacle to his enrolling in the Labour Party, along with other like-minded anti-Semites, with a view to electing Corbyn as its leader. Nor did his declaration in a TV interview that 9/11 'must never be condemned'. In his case, it took months before the Labour Party's highest body, in March 2016, finally enforced its rule that members of rival socialist parties or groups such as Downing's could not be at the same time also members of the Labour Party. However, the NEC initially saw things differently, and only suspended him from membership, a decision which begged the question, since his allegiance and anti-Semitic views were well known, why was he allowed to join in the first place? What was so special about Downing that required the waving of the party's long-standing regulation, Clause II, 5 A? It reads as follows:

Political organisations not affiliated or associated under a national agreement with the party, having their own programme, principles and policy, or distinctive and separate propaganda, or possessing branches in the constituencies, or engaged in the promotion of parliamentary or local government candidates, or having allegiance to

any political organisation situated abroad [Hamas and Hezbollah evidently do not qualify as such], shall be ineligible for membership of the party.

Socialist Fight competed with the SWP in being the most virulently anti-Zionist group on the far left, so much so that some of its comments were indistinguishable from Nazi anti-Semitism. It evidently attracted those who share its leader's stance on this issue, because a recruit to Socialist Fight, Ian Donovan, had previously been expelled from the orthodox Leninist Communist Party of Great Britain (not to be confused with the pro-Corbyn Communist of Britain) on a charge of anti-Semitism, specifically for subscribing to a leftist version of the claim, normally only encountered amongst Arabs, Muslims and Nazis, that there exists a world Jewish conspiracy. It went thus: 'For without the Zionist project, the Jewish-Zionist bourgeoisie, which is a key component of the vanguard of world capital, would have no unifying ethos to hold it together... Without the Zionist project as a unifying force, it would over time dissolve into the various imperialist bourgeoisies.' It was precisely for holding views such as this that he was encouraged to find a more welcoming home in Socialist Fight. Its leader, Gerry Downing, explains: 'I invited Ian Donovan to join Socialist Fight because I studied the dispute he had with the *Weekly Worker* [the CPGB weekly] and concluded that Ian was correct. In fact he was taking a very courageous [sic] stand against the liberal Zionism of the soft left in Britain and globally.'

Socialist Fight also ran the SWP close in its support for what the latter called 'militant Islamism': 'We defend the Islamic State in Syria and Iraq against the bombing of US imperialism'. But what could have commended Downing most to his supporters on the Labour Party's NEC was his tweet denouncing the 'glaringly obvious' 'role the Zionists [for which read 'Jews'] have played in the attempted witch hunt against Jeremy Corbyn's leadership campaign.' In addition to smuggling open anti-Semites into the Labour Party, Momentumistas proved adept at hounding those Labour MPs who did not toe the anti-Zionist line of their leader, especially if the MP happened to be Jewish. Such was the case in the Liverpool Riverside Constituency Labour Party, where a Corbynite clique week after week disrupted normal Party business by demanding that the sitting MP, the Jewish Louise Ellman, declare her attitude towards the state of Israel. On at least three occasions, these sessions involved open anti-Semitic abuse, one local councillor describing the atmosphere generated by the attacks as 'intimidating and hostile'. Momentum activist Vicky Kirby, former Parliamentary candidate for Woking and Vice Chairperson of its Constituency Labour Party was suspended (only suspended!) *and then re-admitted* to the party after tweeting: 'Hitler was a Zionist God' (shades of Livingstone). Other offerings included 'What do you know abt Jews? They've got big noses and support the Spurs' and 'I will never forget and I will make sure my kids teach their children how evil Israel is', and yet another, that Jews 'slaughter the oppressed'. I repeat: she was restored to full party membership. When members demanded her expulsion, Corbyn's office came to her rescue, saying that any further action would be taken only on the basis of 'new evidence'. Given that the evidence cited here did not constitute any kind of proof for Corbyn of anti-Semitism, it is difficult to conceive what this 'new evidence' would have had to consist of to warrant her expulsion. Another prominent Corbynista, Jacqueline Walker, Vice Chairperson of the Momentum National Steering Committee, weighed in with the accusation that the Jews 'were the chief financiers of the sugar and slave trade' and

demanding that the Jews should make amends for their 'contribution to the African Holocaust'. But not Christians and Muslims, who were its real perpetrators. Briefly suspended, as with others of a like mind, she was then restored to full membership.

No such kid glove treatment was afforded *Sunday Times* journalist Rod Liddle, a Labour Party member of some thirty-seven years standing, who was expelled for having the courage to say what everyone knew to be true, that 'anti-Semitism is visceral for many Muslims'. Yet what he said, or rather wrote on his blog, was no different from what the Shi'a Muslim Mehdi Hasan, the biographer of former Jewish Labour leader Ed Miliband, said in the leftist *New Statesman* three years previously, that anti-Semitism was 'our dirty little secret', 'routine and commonplace'. Following his initial suspension, (on grounds that were not made public) Liddle remained unrepentant. Speculating on the probable motives for the action, he wrote on his blog: 'Perhaps it is my suggestion that many Muslims are not favourably inclined towards the Jews', a reasonable deduction from the well-established fact that many high-ranking Muslims had quite openly either denied the Holocaust or proclaimed their admiration for Hitler, including elected office holding members of the Labour Party. Liddle also thought the same of his no less well-founded prediction that 'if the Palestinians were given Israel', as was indeed proposed by Muslim Labour MP Naz Shah, after the 'relocation' of its six million Jews to the USA, 'they would turn it very quickly into a Somalia'. He could have added, just as the PLO did to Beirut. Such home truths, Liddle believed, had evidently enraged Labour's 'new commissars'. Speculating on his forthcoming Kafkaesque trial on as yet unspecified charges (I suggest 'Excessive zeal and honesty in combatting anti-Semitism') Liddle commented, ironically, 'I see this as an opportunity and also a chance to apologise for having dared to suggest that any Muslim anywhere could ever be accused of anti-Semitism, and to insist that my reference to Somalia was a dreadful mistake, for which I am terribly, grovelling sorry - I meant they could turn it into a Switzerland. I sometimes get countries beginning with 'S' confused.' Liddle shared my belief, for which there is ample evidence, that anti-Semitism was, as he put it, 'endemic within two sections of the Labour Party, the perpetually adolescent white middle class lefties and the Muslims - the latter of whom now comprise a significant proportion of Labour activists and voters in parts of London and the dilapidated former mill towns of West Yorkshire and East Lancashire. And Luton. And parts of the Midlands.' Spot on.

Cases such as those described above...and there are many others similar...(See Appendix T) invite the suspicion that it was the election of the anti-Zionist patriarch Corbyn as Labour leader, and with it, the combined impact of the arrival in the party of several thousand fanatical Sharia leftists, together with its Islamisation in areas of dense Muslim diaspora settlement, that triggered an outpouring of public Jew-hatred not experienced in the UK since the pre-war heyday of Sir Oswald Mosley's Black Shirts British Union of Fascists. Incidentally, his admirers were still in business, with Robert Edwards lending his voice to the anti-Israel chorus of Muslims and Sharia leftists with his accusation of Zionist genocide in issue number 17 of his *European Socialist [sic] Action* of 2008; that 'in Israel's "War of Independence", entire villages of innocent Palestinians were slaughtered without mercy.' Ignoring the fact that it was the combined armies of five Arab countries that had invaded the newly-born state to slaughter its outnumbered and poorly-armed Jews, Edwards described the embattled Jews as 'psychopaths' who had waged 'cold blooded campaigns against the Palestinian people' and, recycling on the far right

another charge promoted by the Sharia left, complained that Jews ‘to this day use the same moral blackmail of “anti-Semitism” against those who dare criticise this criminal behaviour’.

The toleration within Labour of a similarly virulent anti-Semitism following the election of the party’s new leader could partly have been put down to the fact that Corbyn and those closest to him had for years mixed in company where such comments were regarded as perfectly normal and justified. One such was Kahdim Hussain, former Labour Mayor of Bradford (again, Shah’s patch) and then a Bradford Labour Councillor, who endorsed a Facebook posting praising Hitler for killing ‘six million Zionists’, a Holocaust that was distinctly at odds with another Muslim version that was also, it would seem, favoured by Downing and other leftist anti-Semites, the one that had nameless Nazis (not Hitler) killing a far smaller number of non-Zionists Jews and allowing (or in Downing’s version, actually ‘transporting’) the remainder to emigrate to an as yet non-existent Israel. But however wildly the fantasies may have varied or even contradicted each other, the bigotry was constant. Coherence and evidence however were never anti-Semitism’s strong point, and so it also proved with Muslim and Sharia left evaluations of the Islamic State. While the Kensington Labour Councillor and ‘Big Brother’ contestant, the Muslim Beinazir Lasharie, was suspended (only suspended) in October 2015 for posting a video entitled ‘ISIS: ‘Israeli Secret Intelligence Service’, and adding her own comment that ‘many people [also] know who was behind 9/11’, John Tummon, formerly of Ken Loach’s anti-Zionist ‘Socialist Unity’ but then, like Loach, a Corbynite Labour Party member, continued to advertise his support for the Islamic State (one with a ‘progressive potential’) as a necessary factor in achieving an ‘overarching settlement in the northern Middle East’.

The claim, first made by the Palestinian Authority, that Israel Intelligence had mastermind the 2016 Brussels massacre (See Appendix Y) quickly went the rounds on Labour’s Corbynite left. Bob Campbell assured fellow party members that Mossad ‘runs ISIS and was behind the Brussels bombings’, an accusation endorsed by John MacAuliffe, who claimed it was ‘a fact’ that ‘all countries back rebel and terror groups all the time’. Following the Corbynista influx, comments such as these became quite routine on Labour’s left. (See Appendix T) Domestically, there was the hounding of pro-Israel Jewish Labour MPs one being Luciana Berger, of Liverpool Wavertree. Despite being (briefly) a member of Corbyn’s shadow cabinet, she was designated as ‘hostile’ to the Labour leader in a list produced by Corbynite loyalists. Opponents of Corbyn claimed this evaluation was motivated by anti-Semitism. True or not, there was no doubt that such was the case when she received anti-Semitic hate mail, including a photo of herself with the star of David superimposed on her forehead. In areas where Labour was partly dependent on the Muslim vote to secure the election of its candidates, in some cases the result had been the conversion of the party from a movement performing its original role of representing the interests of working people, irrespective of creed or race, to one that pandered to the ambitions and anti-Semitic prejudices of those who claimed to speak for ‘the Muslim community’. The classic case was Luton, where Jihadi Islam was so deeply rooted inside the local Labour Party that that it secured the election to the town’s council of an avowed anti-Semite and admirer of Adolf Hitler. Aysegal Gurbuz was a busy young lady. As a student at Warwick University, she served on its Friends of Palestine Society, while back in her home town, and aged only 20, she had already been elected as a Labour councillor for Luton’s High Town Ward

and appointed a member of the panel that supervised the Bedford Police Authority. Since Islam holds that women are endowed with intellects inferior to those of men, and given not only her gender but her age, one naturally suspects that Gurbuz owed her extraordinary rise to the men who dominate the affairs of Luton's Muslim 'community', and would therefore be beholden to them rather than those she was elected to represent. In the main body of this work, evidence was provided that at least one leading and, by gullible *kuffars*, respected Luton cleric held and indeed publicly proclaimed his belief in a World Jewish Conspiracy. Councillor Gurbuz went one step further by praising the politician who dedicated his life to combatting it. On her twitter account, she announced to anyone who might have read it that not Mohammed, but 'my man Hitler' was 'the greatest man in history', possibly because Hitler killed far more Jews than the founder of her religion. Unlike many other anti-Semites, Councillor Gurbuz did not subscribe to the belief that the Nazis were the architects of Israel. On the contrary, 'If it wasn't for my man [sic] Hitler, these Jews would have wiped Palestine years ago.' She also expressed the hope that Iran would use nuclear weapons to honour its Supreme Leader's pledge to 'wipe Israel off the map'. Another posting said, 'Jews can't expect us to sympathise with their history under Hitler'. A tweet before the 2015 General Election seemed to imply that a Tory victory was to be welcomed, because 'Ed Miliband is Jewish. He will never become Prime Minister.' A substantial number of her co-religionists must have agreed, because at that election, the Conservatives secured their highest-ever Muslim vote, and Labour its lowest.

Traditional Labour Party members with an awareness of their movement's past must surely have been asking themselves: how did it come about that someone selected and then elected to hold office on behalf of the Labour Party publicly revealed herself to be an admirer of the head of a regime that not only exterminated six million Jews, but of one that destroyed the most powerful workers movement in history, and was directly responsible for the imprisonment, torture and murder of countless thousands of its most dedicated and courageous militants? The answer was that like so many other Muslim Labour Party members, her prime allegiance lay elsewhere than in the secular world and its labour movements. Hers was to a religion. Nobody in her local party or her Arab friends at Warwick University, a hot bed of anti-Zionism, appeared to have been troubled by her views on the Jews and the Nazis. Hers was after all a milieu in which such attitudes were a commonplace. It was only when her Nazi sympathies were detected by the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism and reported to the relevant authorities was any action taken. In April 2016, High Town Ward's Hitler-loving councillor was suspended from her Labour Party membership... suspended but not summarily expelled. What then did it take to be expelled? After initially implausibly claiming that the tweets were her sister's, (the *Koran* in Chapter 3, Verse 28, sanctions lying to *kuffars*, this being the tactic of *taqiyya*) she admitted they were hers and resigned.

She was very far from being the only Muslim councillor to advertise such views. Salim Mulla, Mayor then a councillor of Blackburn, felt compelled to post on Facebook that 'Zionist Jews are disgrace to humanity' and that ISIS was a Jewish creation. Nottingham Councillor Llyas Aziz, in addition to endorsing Shah's call for what should properly be called her 'final solution of the Israeli Question', could not resist adding for good measure that the Jews of Israel were behaving like Nazis in their treatment of the Palestinians. This comment was then in its turn endorsed by yet another Muslim Labour Councillor, Khadim Hussain. A former Lord Mayor

of Bradford (yet again), Hussain claimed that ‘your [sic] education system only tells you about Anne Frank and the six million Zionists [sic] that were killed by Hitler, and nothing about the millions killed in Africa.’ Whoever these ‘millions’ might have been, we can be he was not referring to victims of the Muslim slave trade. Finally, in this small selection of Jew-baiting Labour Muslims (See Appendix T for more), we have Newport Councillor Miqdad al-Nuaimi, first suspended and then re-instated after tweeting that the Jews of Israel have ‘the same arrogant mentality as the Nazis’. These Muslims quite openly conducted themselves as if they were elected to office to wage a theologically-inspired vendetta against the Jews, and not to represent all their constituents, irrespective of their political and, if any, religious allegiances.

A possible clue as to why, during Corbyn’s term as Labour Leader, certain party members, especially Muslims, were licensed to say things about Jews that hitherto would have resulted in their immediate expulsion, was provided when, in May 2016, a matter days before council, regional and mayoral elections, potential Labour voters were confronted by the spectacle of the suspended (for anti-Semitism) Livingstone trying to persuade TV interviewer Andrew Neil that anti-Semitism was ‘not exactly the same thing as racism’. This was a judgement shared by Corbynista MP Naz Shah for Bradford (again) West who, following her suspension for on-line comments on the Jews, confessed she ‘didn’t get [sic] anti-Semitism as racism’. In her case, understandably, because as one Muslim has publicly admitted, in the ‘Islamic community’, the ‘dirty little secret’ of Jew-hatred is the norm. When Labour’s anti-Semitism crisis became compounded by a challenge to Corbyn’s leadership by Owen Smith in the summer of 2016, so the more was it attributed by vigilant Corbynistas to the machinations of Zionists. A prominent critic of Corbyn and member of Labour Friends of Israel, the Jewish MP Margaret Hodge, was accused by the anti-Zionist website *Electronic Intifada* of ‘launch[ing] a coup against Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn’ whom, the item hastened to add, ‘supports boycotts of Israel’. What it called ‘Labour’s fake anti-Semitism crisis’ had been ‘almost entirely manufactured and was based from the outset on fabricated and exaggerated claims of anti-Semitism that were deliberately aimed at smearing Corbyn, the left, and the Palestinian solidarity movement in general.’ This was echoing what Corbyn had already said on the same subject: ‘There is no [anti-Semitism] crisis. A very small number of cases that have been brought to our attention have been dealt with swiftly and immediately’...yet another Corbyn lie, as I have demonstrated. Livingstone, perhaps forgetting that it was his claim that ‘Hitler supported Zionism’ which triggered the affair, implied that the Jewish issue had been manufactured by anti-Corbyn MPs to lose Labour support at the polls: ‘You’ve had smear after smear against Jeremy. The anti-Semitism stuff [sic!] damaged us with the local elections, but not enough to trigger a leadership challenge then.’

With their leader’s grip on the party supposedly threatened by Zionist plottings, Corbyn’s street army rose to the challenge. As his support amongst Labour MPs shrank, outside Westminster, in Il Piazza Del Parlamento, Corbyn rallied his enraged *squadristas*, some sporting on their red T shirts the snappy logo ‘Eradicate the Right-Wing Blairite Vermin’. His audience, partly composed of SWP Brexiteers, demonstrated their loyalty to the beleaguered *Duce* with rhythmic chants of ‘Corbyn, Corbyn, Corbyn’, interspersed with ‘Blairite scum’ and ‘Blairites out’, while holding aloft North Korean-style placards bearing portraits of

the Dear Leader. Around the UK, constituency Party offices were besieged, one having a brick thrown through a window. Anti-Corbyn MPs were bombarded with death and even rape threats to themselves and their families, with some requiring police protection. The level of intimidation was such that even the party's Corbynista-dominated NEC found it necessary to suspend all local party meetings until voting for leader had been completed. And of course, anti-Semitism was never far away. The leftist but pro-Israel shadow cabinet member Jess Phillips revealed in her resignation letter to Corbyn that 'writing or saying anything against you risks my job, the livelihood of family. The threats are rolling in.' Among her other crimes, her letter said, was that of being...yes, but of course, a 'Zionist plotter', bought, she later told a meeting of Labour MPs, by 'Zionist money'. One of Corbyn's most vocal trade union supporters, Len McCluskey, claimed in a TV interview that Momentum had nothing to do with such incidents. It was the work of intelligence agents posing as Corbynites: 'Do you believe for one moment that the security forces are not involved in dark practices?... Do you think there's not all kinds of right wingers who are not able to disguise themselves and stir up trouble? I find that amazing if people think that isn't happening.' Whether it was Mossad or MI5, the consensus was that opposition to Corbyn had to be a conspiracy, not one motivated by genuine and sincere disagreement with his policies and his fitness to lead the party. Unlike the first, Corbyn's campaign in his second Labour leadership contest had been dogged from the very beginning by a succession of damning (at least for some) revelations concerning his many and long-standing associations with avowed anti-Semites, so it was only to be expected that the 'Jewish question' would loom large in the dramatic events unfolding in his bid for survival. On June 30, 2016, one week after the Brexit referendum, at the meeting where Corbyn launched the Labour Party's report on its internal inquiry into anti-Semitism, copies of a leaflet were circulated claiming the accusations of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party were 'unfounded' and therefore the inquiry and report were 'unnecessary'. Very much in the same spirit, and evidently unable even on such an occasion to resist an opportunity to attack Zionism, in introducing the report, Corbyn drew a direct parallel between Israel and the Islamic State: 'Our Jewish friends [sic...closet anti-Semites habitually boast of having 'Jewish friends'] are no more responsible for the actions of Israel or the Netanyahu government than our Muslim friends are for those of various self-styled Islamic states.' While there were 57 states, if we include the Palestinian Authority, that had Islam as their official religion, there was only one that called itself the Islamic State. And surely, he could not have been referring to his former employer, the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The fallout following these comments was immediate and for Corbyn, should have been devastating. UK Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mervis said Corbyn's comments 'however they were intended, were themselves offensive', while his predecessor, Jonathan Sacks, was less charitable, describing them as

a demonization of the highest order, an outrage. That this occurred at the launch of the report into the Labour Party's recent troubles with anti-Semitism shows how deep the sickness is in parts of left-wing British politics today. Israel is a democratic state. The Islamic State is a terrorist entity. In the current political climate, this is all the more shocking.

Two other Rabbis, one ultra-Orthodox, (and also a Labour Party member) and one Liberal, weighed in with similar highly critical comments, the gist being that Corbyn himself was afflicted by the same prejudices that the report was supposedly designed to combat. Avrohom Pinter, the Labour Rabbi, pointed out, 'one can disagree with the policies of the Israeli government, but to compare the democratically elected representatives of a sovereign state to a terrorist state which beheads people is totally unacceptable.'

The same fallout struck much closer to home when after only a few hours in office, Corbyn's newly-appointed Jewish Shadow Minister for Europe, Fabian Hammond, resigned, citing his leader's lamentable performance at the report launch. Within minutes of the incident, Corbyn had been reported to Labour's Compliance Unit for a possible breach of his own party's newly-adopted rules on anti-Semitism. The event sunk yet deeper into anti-Semitic slime when the *Guardian* journalist Marc Wadsworth of 'Momentum Black Connexions'(sic), was filmed accosting a Jewish Labour MP, Ruth Smeeth. He refused to hand her a press release calling for the deselection of anti-Corbyn MPs (including Smeeth herself), accused her of involvement in a 'media conspiracy' and then ostentatiously made a note of her name, which he surely already knew. Wadsworth then rounded off his performance by bellowing to his fellow journalists 'how white you all are', evidently a demonstration of 'black truth' exposing 'white privilege'. Smeeth left the meeting in tears. Corbyn saw the incident and not only failed to intervene but was videoed later shaking hands and chatting with his Momentum comrade. The following recorded exchange took place: Wadsworth: 'I outed Smeeth, bloody talking to the Torygraph this morning.' Corbyn: 'I sent you a text about it.' The incident had apparently been pre-arranged. The leaflet in question described the 172 MP's who voted no-confidence in Corbyn as 'traitors' and endorsed Livingstone's call for their de-selection as candidates at the next general election. And yet from all this, Corbyn emerged unscathed, at least as far as most Labour members were concerned, because two months later, they voted him back as Leader with 62% of the vote, nine per cent more than in his victory over Andy Burnham in 2015.

As for the report, while it spoke vaguely of a 'toxic atmosphere', it deployed the classic device of the straw man, fatuously insisting that the party was not 'overrun by anti-Semitism'. But nobody had claimed it was. Much worse, not only did the report fail to provide a working definition of anti-Semitism, nowhere in its 41 pages did it find room to cite so much as a single instance of the many cases of anti-Semitic statements made by Labour Party members (I cite more than a hundred in this work, see especially Appendix T), and to reveal the identity of those who made them. Here was an opportunity to show that the Labour Party meant business when it talked of combatting anti-Semitism. But instead, there was total silence on statements and activities that had been the subject of national media comment and criticism in the later stages of Corbyn's 2015 leadership bid. Typical of the report's several toothless recommendations was one that proposed that anti-Semitism could be dealt with by sanctions other than suspension or expulsion. As many expected, and given that the guilty parties were either Muslims, supporters of Corbyn, or both, the inquiry had produced a report that was little more than a whitewash. Its failings were summed up by Jonathan Sacerdoti, Communications Officer of the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism:

It did not examine the disgraceful cases of anti-Semitism in the party [such as, for example, 'Hitler is my man' and 'relocate Israel to the United States' to name but two of many] or even more disgraceful handling by the party leadership, including Jeremy Corbyn, who presides over a regime of the lightest slaps on wrists for the most deliberate and offensive anti-Semites. Inexcusably, the report proposes making it harder to suspend anti-Semites and keeping suspensions secret so as not to affect elections.

In a well-merited thrust at the company kept over the years by Corbyn, Sacerdoti drew attention to the report's rejection of 'any claims of anti-Semitism arising from sharing a platform with anti-Semites', and its suggestion that 'any anti-Semitic incident coming to light after two years should not be considered, a limitation period so short it has no parallel in any other disciplinary regime that we are aware of.' The report read as if Corbyn had drafted it himself, to protect himself. Having just experienced at first hand a sample of the Momentum Jew-baiting the report was designed to cover up, Ruth Smeeth issued a statement:

I call on Jeremy Corbyn to resign immediately and make way for somebody with the backbone to confront racism and anti-Semitism in our party and in the country...Until today I had made no public comment about Jeremy's ability to lead our party, but the fact that he failed to intervene is final proof for me that he is unfit to lead, and that a Labour Party under his stewardship cannot be a safe place for British Jews.

Hardly an exaggeration, bearing in mind she was targeted by a Corbynista anti-Semite at, of all places, at event convened to promote Labour's opposition to anti-Semitism. Days before the September 2016 Labour Conference, Ruth Smeeth revealed that she had received 25,000 abusive online messages, including death threats. Many were of a blatantly anti-Semitic nature. One accused her of being a 'CIA/MI5/Mossad informant', and three others, 'a Yid cunt', a 'fucking traitor' and a 'dyke'. Abuse on this scale and consistency could only have been planned and co-ordinated, and understandably, Smeeth decided it was necessary for her own safety to attend the Labour Party conference accompanied by a bodyguard. A kinder politics. (It was this that led me to end my 40 years membership of the Labour Party. See Appendix N)

Also on the eve of the conference, more evidence accumulated that Momentum had no intention of reining in their attacks on the party's Jews. A campaign video released on Corbyn's official social media website featured topics that his supporters said they were tired of hearing about. One of those was anti-Semitism. The Campaign Against Anti-Semitism (CAA) responded by sending a letter of complaint to Party Deputy Leader Tom Watson, accusing Corbyn of 'committing acts that are grossly detrimental to the party' by 'characterising Jewish people as dishonest and dissembling in their reporting of anti-Semitism'. Its letter described how 'Corbyn's personal Facebook and Twitter accounts released a video featuring supporters declaring they were "tired of hearing" about anti-Semitism, characterising the Jewish community's complaints as "rubbish", physically and metaphorically to be tossed to the floor.' Before being withdrawn, the video had attracted 200,000 endorsements. At the same time, police were reported to have interviewed the author of a 1,000-word description of how he would murder Ruth Smeeth. Initially thought to be the work of a Neo-Nazi, in the event, the author proved to be a Labour Party Corbynista. At the conference itself, more evidence

emerged that Smeeth's concerns for her safety were well-founded. A leaflet, wholly Nazi in tone and content, was distributed to delegates demanding the dis-affiliation from the Labour party of the Jewish Labour Movement on the grounds that it was involved in a Zionist conspiracy against Corbyn, and being Jewish, was 'a representative of a foreign power'. Back in May 1984, together with among other anti-Zionists, Livingstone, Corbyn had launched a campaign to secure the expulsion of the Jewish Labour Movement from the Labour Party and, for good measure, for the TUC to sever all its fraternal links with the Israeli trade union movement, *Histadrut*. (There was no such support from these two for a campaign I was personally involved in at the same time for the TUC to sever its 'fraternal' links with state-run company unions of the Soviet bloc and the Labour Party with Soviet-bloc communist parties.)

While Jews were accused of prioritising Israeli concerns over those of the UK, no such considerations of national loyalty applied to those Labour Party Muslims who openly proclaimed their support for Middle Eastern movements that waged a war of terror against this 'foreign power'. The demand to expel the Jewish Labour Movement from the Labour Party was identical in its anti-Semitic motivation to the eviction, with the connivance of security officials, of Jewish trade unionists from the TUC's 2015 Tolpuddle Martyrs commemoration event in Devon by a gang of Pro-Palestinian thugs. Very much in the same spirit, at the 2016 Labour Party conference, an Israeli journalist reporting a Momentum fringe meeting had his credentials revoked little more than an hour after receiving them, with the transparently spurious excuse there were no more available. How then, did he get them in the first place? Someone not fully up to speed with Corbyn's version of zero tolerance of anti-Semitism had obviously blundered. Conference had not done with its abuse of the Jewish Labour Movement. When its Chairman, the Jewish Mike Katz, addressed the penultimate session, he was barracked and heckled for saying the lack of Jewish support for Labour made him 'weep' and that the report on anti-Semitism had failed to address the problem properly. Delegates shouted 'rubbish' and 'you don't speak for all Jews'.

On the final day of the conference, the story broke that at a Labour Party so called 'training event' for combatting anti-Semitism, Momentum Vice-Chairman Jackie Walker, who earlier in the year had been briefly suspended for such choice comments as 'the Jews were the chief financiers of the sugar and slave trade' and 'the Jewish Holocaust does not allow Zionists to do what they want', in the same spirit had endorsed a proposal first made by Corbyn in 2011 to in effect 'de-Zionise' Holocaust Memorial Day by renaming it 'Genocide Memorial Day'. It would be 'wonderful [sic!]' said Walker, if Holocaust Day was 'open to all people who experienced Holocaust', starting, we can be sure, with the Palestinians. At the same 'training session', Walker had made comments about the Jews so extreme that they led to a second suspension. Among messages posted in her defence, one read: 'This was no training event. It was an Israeli-sponsored honey trap' and another: 'If Jackie Walker is sacked, I am done with Momentum. I will not betray the victims of Zionism.' Another read: 'Right wing smear tactics from Zionists and the right wing of the Labour Party. Jackie said NOTHING that can be construed as anti-Semitism...I am a member of Momentum and if the [Momentum] Committee expels Jackie then I can guarantee hundreds will stop paying their subscription.' When a motion was put to the Momentum Steering Committee to remove her from her post as Momentum Vice-Chairperson, but clearing her of all charges of anti-

Semitism and opposing her expulsion from the Labour Party, it was carried by seven votes to three. Even though suspended from the Labour Party, she retained her position as a member of the Steering Committee. After much toing and froing, Walker was finally expelled from the Labour Party in March 2019.

In addition to Momentum, Labour Leader Corbyn's second in command, Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell ran his own far left outfit, the Labour Representation Committee. Here, anti-Zionism shaded over into undisguised anti-Semitism. In 2017, its Chairman, John Cushman, published an article on the Committee's website which alleged that under its pre-Corbyn leadership (the Jewish Ed Miliband was his predecessor) had become a 'pawn of Zionist organisations'. But not only the Labour Party: 'The most senior members of both the main parties and the Liberal Democrats' were 'part of the network of Israeli influence.' If not in so many words, he was saying the UK was ruled by the Jews. As for McDonnell, from the early 2000s, he was featured on his website glorifying Palestinian suicide attacks on Israeli civilians, one posting quoting the father of a suicide bomber who killed 19 mainly teenaged Jews in a Tel Aviv disco: 'When martyrs blow themselves up, the Jews and the Americans listen'. After another suicide bombing that ended in the deaths of two Jews in a Jerusalem supermarket, McDonnell praised the attack as a 'successful heroic operation' that was 'an example to every Palestinian woman'. Unlike many on the left, McDonnell did not even pretend to support the 'two state solution'. 'Even if the Zionist state was the size of a postage stamp, it would have no right to exist'. McDonnell was no less forthcoming in his accusations of Israeli genocide. 'What's going on', he told a Gaza rally in November 2012, 'is effectively an attempt at genocide against the Palestinians.' It should have come no surprise then that sharing as he did McDonnell's views on the iniquities of Israel, on being elected Labour Leader, Corbyn chose McDonnell as his shadow chancellor of the exchequer, along with another no less fanatical anti-Zionist, Livingstone, as his defence (sic) adviser.

As I have already said, anti-Semitism followed Corbyn and his inner circle around like a bad smell. But what else should have expected after their spending most of their political careers in a sewer? Under his leadership, Momentum continued issuing blank cheques for Jew-baiting as if the Chakrabarti report had never happened. Setting an example in this respect, on the Sunday following the release of the toothless report, and safe in the knowledge that his party's proposed rules on anti-Semitism would him allow to continue as before to associate with his anti-Semitic terrorist friends from Hamas and Hezbollah, Corbyn was due back in his natural element at the annual anti-Israel 'al-Quds Day' march sponsored by his Iranian pimps, which, as in previous years, ended with a rally outside the Embassy of the Great Satan in London's Grosvenor Square. On campuses around the UK, the Sharia left enforced a policy of 'no platforms' for ex-Muslim feminists, free-speech campaigners and supporters of Israel, but as the report's guidelines recommended, the Labour Party's leader sharing a platform with known anti-Semites and advocate of a Jewish genocide was quite in order. The event's organisers, the Corbyn-admired and comically-named 'Iranian Human Rights Commission', announced that as on previous occasions, the UK's highest profile anti-Zionist, would be 'leading the march'. However, already in deep enough water for his anti-Semitic associations, he, or more likely his minders, decided that this time, a low profile was the best option. Low profile was not the order the day however for Corbyn's Hezbollah friends who as they marched, held aloft their movement's flag, the

displaying of which possibly violated section three of the Terrorist Act of 2,000. Asked to comment on the flaunting on the streets of London of the emblem of an anti-Semitic, terrorist movement dedicated to the destruction of Israel, London Mayor Sadiq Khan said that he understood 'the concerns of the Jewish community and the distress these flags cause many Londoners', but the matter was in the hands of the police (and, therefore, the Home Office).

As always, the Quds Day proceedings home and abroad were accompanied by messages of encouragement from Iran's clergy, with one from Hossein Salami announcing that there were '100,000 missiles' in Lebanon alone, and thousands more around the Islamic world, all ready to 'strike at the heart of the Zionist regime, awaiting the command, so that when the trigger is pulled, the accursed black dot will be wiped off the geopolitical map of the world once and for all.' Thus the religion of peace. Though the military wing of Hezbollah was banned in the UK as a terrorist organisation, its so-called 'political wing', under whose auspices the Quds Day rally was officially conducted, was not. In reply to claims that the distinction between the military (that is to say terrorist) and political wings of the move was fictitious, since they shared the same flag, the Home Office replied 'the context and manner in which the flag is displayed must demonstrate that it is specifically in support of the proscribed elements of the group.' So had Corbyn taken his usual place on the speaker's rostrum festooned by Hezbollah, flags, legally all would have been well. Finally, in February 2019, despite Corbynista Labour protests, a blanket ban was imposed on 'The Party of God'.

On June 4 2016, the day after the Quds Day rally, Corbyn found himself being questioned, all too gently, by his old friend and fellow Islamophile of many years standing, anti-Rushdie campaigner Labour MP Keith Vaz, in his capacity as Chairman the House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs. The subject was Labour Party anti-Semitism. His lamentable and at time, distinctly shifty performance, consisting of little more than a succession of diversions, evasions and lies, can be viewed on line, so I leave it to the reader to draw their own conclusions as to whether such a person was fit to hold any public office, let alone that of a leader of a party or, Allah forbid, Prime Minister. At the outset of the proceedings, after being pressed on the matter, Corbyn finally conceded that the Labour Party's own inquiry had not been independent, since it had been conducted by someone who herself was a Labour Party member. (Having joined when she was given the task, she was on its completion elevated to the House of Lords for what many saw a reward for producing an anodyne report that essentially allowed anti-Semitic party members to continue as before.)

A number of exchanges captured perfectly just how seriously Corbyn took the issue of anti-Semitism within his own party. Setting the tone for the entire proceedings, at the very outset, he claimed, contrary to other accounts that had put the number nearer to 80, that fewer than twenty members had been suspended (only suspended) after allegations of anti-Semitic conduct of one kind or another, implying, as he and his supporters had done on previous occasions, that the whole affair was a storm in a tea cup. Subsequent revelations as to its actual scale, and not least his own track record on the 'Jewish question', would give the lie to that claim.

Asked by Vaz what should be done with party members who use words like Hitler and 'Zio' to insult Jews, Corbyn replies, 'what will happen is they will be told they should not use them', this being the approach recommended by the party's powder-puff Chakrabarti report. So, a party member calls a Jew a Nazi, and is told

not to say it again. And that would be that. Vaz, obviously dissatisfied by Corbyn's laid-back approach, told him that Committee members were concerned that the report described such manifestations of anti-Semitism as merely 'unhappy [sic] incidents'. Corbyn disagreed, defending the report as 'a bold step that we should be commended for', so bold indeed that it recommended that members guilty of anti-Semitic conduct should not be necessarily expelled or even suspended, and that it was quite in order for members to appear on the same platform, as Corbyn did regularly, with anti-Semites.

Questioned as to why a report devoted to the problem of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party offered no definition of anti-Semitism, Corbyn gave this substitute for an answer: 'I thought it would be very obvious what anti-Semitism is.' But if the offence is never defined, how can anyone be found guilty of it? And we know that within Corbyn's immediate circle there was at least one prominent anti-Zionist who had so defined anti-Semitism, at least to his own satisfaction, as to be able to claim that not once in his more than forty years in the Labour Party had he ever encountered it, and that moreover, anti-Semitism was 'not exactly the same thing as racism'. If so, why the inquiry?

Then there was the question of Israel, and Corbyn's decades of close involvement with campaigns, movements and individuals who, to put it politely, did not wish Israel and its Jewish population well. Asked if he thought the state of Israel had a right to exist, Corbyn, seemingly caught off his guard, replies, 'Sorry?' Asked again, he replies with a blatantly evasive *non-sequitur*: 'Yes, the state of Israel exists, of course'. Yes, indeed it does, despite all the bloody endeavours of Comrade Corbyn's Jihadi 'friends'. But that was not the question, so Vaz tries for a third time. 'Yes, of course, our party's policy is for a two-state solution'. And so it is, though it most certainly is not that of his 'friends' Hamas and Hezbollah. But was it Corbyn's? This surely was the nub of the issue. But Vaz chose not to pursue it, perhaps because he already knew the answer, and wanted to save his friend from the dilemma of either of answering it truthfully or telling yet another lie that might put in him bad standing with his Jihadi 'friends'. I provide in this work irrefutable evidence of what Corbyn's truthful answer to that question would have been, had Vaz asked it.

Instead, Vaz moved on to the anti-Zionist company Corbyn had kept over the years, highlighted by the meeting he hosted in Parliament in March 2009 for representatives of Hezbollah, of whom he said, together with Hamas, it was a 'pleasure and an honour' to call his 'friends'. When pressed by Vaz to say whether they were still his friends, Corbyn replied that he had used 'inclusive language' to further a 'peace process', but that they were not his friends now, and 'never were'. Readers are of course free to believe him if they wish, but which statement? Because either he was lying then, or lying to the Select Committee. As for a 'peace process' (something he had also recommended be pursued with the Islamic State) even the gullible Corbyn, for all his 'inclusive language' during his dealings with his friends in both Hamas and Hezbollah, must have realised that the two terrorist movements were seeking, not a negotiated peace with Israel, but its destruction, along with the murder of its entire Jewish population, because all he had to do to be aware of this was to read their founding charters, and the declarations of their leaders. Corbyn's claim that his involvement with anti-Semitic, genocidal terrorists was purely in the interests of a 'peace process' not only non-existent but impossible was, however, not challenged by Vaz. Neither was Corbyn asked to give evidence

of the tangible results, if any, of his peace-making efforts, probably because Vaz knew they amounted to zero.

Perhaps the most extraordinary and damning exchanges occurred in relation to Corbyn's dealings with two notorious anti-Semites. The first was Sultan Raed Salah, the Hamas official who claimed that no Jews went to work in the World Trade Centre on 9/11, and that Jews use murdered children's blood to mix with their Passover unleavened bread. The second slander had been the cause of his conviction in an Israeli court. His notorious anti-Semitism also led in 2011 to an attempt by the Home Office to have him deported from the UK when Corbyn invited him to attend an anti-Zionist rally in Leicester and a meeting the next day of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign hosted by Corbyn at Westminster. Salah appeared at the Leicester event, but was arrested in London before the second. He was electronically tagged and, pending the outcome of his appeal against deportation, placed under house arrest where, Corbyn related to the Select Committee, he visited him, even though Corbyn must have been fully aware on what grounds Salah's freedom of movement was being restricted.

After a lengthy legal process, an immigration tribunal found that although Salah was, as the Home Office originally claimed, an anti-Semite, his right to free speech entitled him not to be deported. (I agree with this decision. It is a scandal however that the Home Office had also denied entry into the UK of a US scholar and a Dutch MP, not for telling lies about the Jews, but the truth about Islam.) The fact that Salah was an avowed anti-Semite of the most extreme kind did not seem to have troubled Corbyn in the least, engaged as the Sheikh undoubtedly was in the noble fight to eliminate the state of Israel. Had not Corbyn praised Salah as an 'honoured citizen' with 'a voice that must be heard', and looked forward to the day that he could take tea with him on the House of Commons terrace? Vaz reminded Corbyn that he had shared a platform with Salah, 'who was found guilty by a British Judge of using the Blood Libel, the lie that Jews use Christians for rituals. You invited him for tea in the terrace of the House of Commons.' Corbyn saw nothing wrong with this, calmly replying: 'He didn't come', as if that resolved the matter of his involvement with a notorious anti-Semite. Vaz repeats, 'but you invited him'. Corbyn then explains why he couldn't make it:

He was under house arrest. I met him to discuss the terms of his house arrest. He is an Israeli national and I was quite surprised if he was seen to be such a dangerous figure in Israel that he was allowed to travel. He travelled to this country and I did meet him while he was under house arrest and I had a very long discussion with him about how to bring about an eventual peace process in the Middle East and his concerns about the Palestinian people living within the borders of the state of Israel, and I said to him that I condemned any form of racism.

Let us see exactly what Salah had to say in a notorious speech made in Jerusalem in 2007 about the so-called 'blood libel', and then ask ourselves, how can anyone who wishes well of the Palestinian cause bring discredit on that cause not only by associating with someone who promotes such vile slanders against the Jews, but acts as their public champion?

We have never allowed ourselves to knead the bread for the breaking of the fast during the blessed month of Ramadan with the blood of the children. And if someone wants a wider explanation you should ask what used to happen to some of the children of

Europe, whose blood was mixed in the dough of the holy breads. God almighty, is this religion? God will confront you for what you are [sic] doing.

Vaz, palpably perplexed and embarrassed that his friend of many years did not seem in the least perturbed by Salah's particularly virulent anti-Semitism, asked if he would still invite him to tea on the House of Commons terrace. Corbyn replied, 'No, I don't think so' and added, sadly, 'but he is not coming back anyway'. He was then pressed on his no less amicable relations with the Reverend Stephen Sizer, who shared both Sultan Salah's belief that the Jews were responsible for 9/11 and a platform with Corbyn at the 2012 annual Iran-sponsored Quds Day march in London. Vaz put it to him: 'You wrote to defend a friend, Stephen Sizer, a vicar disciplined by the Church of England for anti-Semitism, saying he was under attack by a pro-Israeli smear campaign. Do you regret those comments?' Corbyn again evaded the question, opting instead, as he did with Salah, to sing, somewhat incoherently, the praises of yet another anti-Semitic brother-in-arms in the anti-Zionist movement: 'I've met Stephen Sizer on many occasions in his role as a vicar [?] and as somebody that does support Palestinian people, who feels with much justification that their human rights are under attack. There are people living in the Palestinian territories, and I was very surprised when that [sic] was done to him'. The inference that could easily be drawn from Corbyn's defence of Sizer was that he had been disciplined for supporting the Palestinians, and not his views about 9/11 and the Jews. Even so, Corbyn believed that Sizer's claims about 9/11, which implied there had been a Jewish conspiracy to defame Islam, did not constitute anti-Semitism, and consequently, did not deserve the reprimand he received from his church (As for himself, he had said on another occasion that 9/11 had been, quote, 'manipulated'.) So Vaz tried again: 'Do you still support what he does, support what he says?' Again, Corbyn evaded the question: 'I supported what he was doing in supporting the Palestinian people. The things [sic] that emerged later I was unaware of at the time.' So why then write a letter in Sizer's defence claiming that he had been victimised because he had 'dared to speak out against Zionism'?

When challenged, as he was on this occasion, to justify his many and long-standing associations with notorious anti-Semites, Corbyn's defence had always been that irrespective of their opinions of the Jews, which of course he did not share, his reason for collaborating with such people had been their mutual concern for the cause of the Palestinians. Puerile though it was, one could at least take this excuse seriously if Corbyn's concern for the Palestinians had been extended to the nearly 3,500 Palestinians who had been killed in Syria between 2011 and mid 2016 as a direct consequence of the civil wars being waged in that country. But since they were not victims of a Zionist 'genocide', their deaths passed unprotested by Palestinian leaders, the Sharia left and Corbyn himself. Not only was there silence. In 2011, Corbyn was a guest of the very regime responsible for those deaths.

These and other similar exchanges established beyond any doubt that Corbyn was prepared to ignore or deny the existence of the most extreme manifestations of anti-Semitism in those he chose to collaborate with so long as the shared goal was opposition to the policies and, as I firmly believe, existence of the state of Israel. The very next day after the hearing, just what Corbyn's 'bold step' in combating anti-Semitism amounted to became clear when Naz Shah, the suspended anti-Semitic Muslim MP for Bradford West, who not only tweeted that the Jews of Israel should be 'relocated' to the USA, but also, in another tweet that had been

consistently ignored in her case, that ‘never forget that everything that Hitler did in Germany was legal’, after a *pro forma* apology that could not possibly have been sincere, was re-instated to full membership. It was a decision that must have left many non-Corbynite Labour Party members wondering, if advocating the Nazi-style deportation of six million Jews and claiming that Hitler committed no crimes are not sufficient grounds for expulsion, what is? Could it be mere chance that until her suspension Shah was an ‘adviser’ to Corbyn’s second-in-command and some say, *eminence grise*, the no less obsessively anti-Zionist Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell? Keir Starmer, possibly with one eye on the Muslim vote, retained Shah, previously Corbyn’s shadow minister for Women and Equalities, in his post Corbyn shadow cabinet, first for Crime Reduction, then Community Cohesion (sic) and, as of September 2023, again Women and Equalities (also sic).

On June 16, 2016, Shadow Foreign Secretary Hilary Benn was sacked by Corbyn after making a number of statements in the Commons on Syria and the Islamic State that were diametrically opposed to the policies of his Leader. Benn’s dismissal was followed by the synchronised resignation of 63 of Corbyn’s shadow front bench team, together with a joint statement by all 20 Labour Euro MPs demanding his resignation. The day before, a no-confidence vote of MPs had been carried by 172 to 40, leaving Corbyn with insufficient loyalist candidates to fill all the shadow vacancies. This inevitable, long anticipated and historically unprecedented revolt had initially been signalled on December 2, 2015, when in a speech in the Commons, Labour’s decidedly non-Sharia Shadow Foreign Secretary Hilary Benn defied and outraged his leader by supporting a UN resolution and Parliamentary motion authorising the bombing of the Islamic State, and compounded his sin by listing some of its worst atrocities and describing its regime as fascist. So it was not unexpected when within hours of the EU referendum result, which many in the party blamed on Corbyn’s at best, lukewarm commitment to a remain vote, Benn finally raised the standard of revolt and was then promptly sacked by Corbyn.

Just for once, though not by design, Diane Abbott’s opaque pronouncement that ‘if there is any politician who stands for not-politics-as-usual it’s Jeremy Corbyn’. was spot on. No previous Labour Leader had ever been accused of failing to deal with anti-Semitism in his party, let alone been accused of it himself, or associating with representatives of movements whose declared goals were the elimination of an entire country and the extermination of 80% of its population. By now, even the *Guardian* had reluctantly admitted, prematurely, as it turned out, that ‘the Corbyn experiment [sic] is effectively over at Westminster’. But deep in his bunker, with the rumble of the rebels’ tanks and guns growing ever louder, deserted even by some of his most faithful supporters, yet convinced of the rightness of his cause, Corbyn fought on. He promoted untested new officers (some whom in their turn deserted him) disposed of imaginary forces and talked of victory, victory over the traitors within, and the enemies without.

As the pressure built up on Corbyn to step down, stories found their way into the media that the strain was beginning to tell. If the front man caved in, all would be lost. At all costs, the show had to be kept on the road. So while projecting to the party and public at large an image of a powerful leader and creative thinker called upon and eminently qualified to set his country on a new path, every effort was made to insulate him from hostile or even friendly advice. To keep the media at bay, in public he was always surrounded by a team of ‘minders’ headed by the silver

spoon Winchester and Oxford duo of Milne and Schneider. Labour MPs were denied access to him, even including the party's Deputy Leader Tom Watson, because he might 'jab his finger at him'. In terms redolent of the 'safe spacism' and 'no platformism' of the university campus (whence hailed many of the cadres of Momentum), a request for an audience with the Dear Leader was rejected on the grounds that Corbyn was 'a seventy-year-old man' to whom his minders had 'a duty of care'. A duty of care to protect him from a private conversation with his own party's Deputy Leader? To he who would be *Prime Minister*? A duty of care for someone who according to his minders, needed to be protected from having a finger pointed at him, and yet was praised by trade union official Len McClusky of UNITE, as 'a man of steel'? (Could this have been a Freudian slip? This translates into the language of Putin as 'Stalin'.)

As if aware of his fragility, even rebel front bench MP's carefully chose their words in their resignation letters, balancing criticism of his glaring inadequacies with what in many cases seemed an agreed *pro forma* listing of Corbyn's supposedly positive qualities... 'kind and genuinely decent', 'a man of principle'. This is of course standard procedure for someone whose incompetence requires that they be 'let go'. Yet given that his extra-Parliamentary causes and associations were known to all concerned, and had been a subject of much public debate and concern from the outset of his leadership bid, it was strange to find not a single MP as much as alluding to them, even though they rendered him far less fit to hold any office in the Labour Party than did his chronically meagre political and intellectual capacities. How could one be 'kind' and 'genuinely decent' and at the same have as their 'friends' and political associates those who seek the extermination of the Jews and recycle the vilest anti-Semitic myths?

It had been said in Corbyn's defence, both by himself and his supporters, that he cultivated these friendships and associations in order firstly to enable others to hear what they had to say, and secondly, to persuade them to seek other means than violence to obtaining their ends. Persuading is one thing, regularly sharing platforms and never dissenting in public with those whom you have failed to persuade is another, which is what Corbyn had been doing for two decades and more. Could he, in his defence, perhaps have pointed to any area of policy where his friends in Hamas and Hezbollah had, to the smallest degree, deviated in word or deed from their declared aim of destroying the state of Israel by armed struggle? He was able to provide neither, even though it was obviously in their interests to let their useful idiot believe that one day, such a shift might occur, because that is that is exactly what another gullible fool was led to believe in his dealings with another genocidal anti-Semite, Hitler.

After decades in the far-left political wilderness, but now with their noses in the Labour Party trough, when the tide threatened to turn against them, those who pulled the strings of the Corbynista project showed no signs of going quietly. But there is no doubt that they had been caught off balance by the onset of a crisis that over the next three years, would see Corbyn summoned to appear before a House of Common Select Committee hearing on his handling of his party's anti-Semitism, followed by three Parliamentary debates on the same subject, and three investigations by the Metropolitan Police, the Equality and Human Rights Commission and BBC Panorama, yet again into the same subject, and mass resignations from the party up to the highest levels.

All this lay in the future when super-loyalist Diane Abbott, shadow minister for International Development and later Shadow Home Secretary, took the bullet for Corbyn. Notorious for her racist comment about nurses from Finland with blue eyes and blond hair taking jobs in the UK's NHS, she refused in an interview on BBC TV to condemn as anti-Semitic a no less notorious cartoon that had appeared in Livingstone's Gaddafi-financed *Labour Herald* depicting an Israeli Jew in a Nazi uniform giving the Hitler salute and captioned 'The Final Solution'. Her response was to ignore the cartoon and instead claim that 'it is a smear to say that the Labour Party has a problem with anti-Semitism'. And her leader was no less relaxed, insisting that there was 'not a problem' with anti-Semitism, and that talk of a crisis 'comes from those who are nervous of the strength of the party at local level'. Len McCluskey, General Secretary of UNITE trade union, predicted that 'once the mood music [sic!] of anti-Semitism dies down then next week there'll be another subject'. Yes, indeed...the fallout from the EU referendum. However, another official of the same union, the Corbynite Martin Meyer, who also sat on the Labour Party's National Executive Committee, begged to differ. The crisis was real enough, and had been instigated by...yes, of course, just as Livingstone claimed, the Jews. In an email titled 'How Israel manufactured UK Labour Party's anti-Semitism crisis', Meyer claimed that the whole affair had been the work of the 'Blairite right wing' in cahoots with a 'Zionist lobby'.

There was a time when one could have been certain that some of the views of the Muslims and Sharia leftists extensively quoted above and elsewhere in this work could only have been those of avowed Nazis, a time when advertising such bigotry would have not only have been regarded as incompatible with membership of the Labour Party, but of any party other than one of the extreme right. Under the new Sharia dispensation of Ayatollah Corbyn, this was no longer the case. Hatred of the Jews, always the common coin of the far right, had now become also the lowest common denominator of the far left, where it found shared ground with large swathes of the UK's Muslim diaspora, increasing numbers of whom were acquiring positions of influence both in the constituencies and as elected representatives in local and central government. Do not take my word for the truth of this allegation. A (liberal) Muslim himself, this is what Mehdi Hasan wrote in the *New Statesman* on March 23, 2013, in an article entitled, *The sorry truth is that the virus of anti-Semitism has infected the British Muslim Community*:

It pains me to say this, but anti-Semitism isn't just tolerated in some sections of the British Muslim community, it's routine and commonplace...it's our dirty little secret...I can't keep count of the number of Muslims I have come across from close relatives and friends to perfect strangers for whom wired and wacky anti-Semitic conspiracy theories are the default explanation for a range of national and international events.

As for the Holocaust, his fellow Muslims replied, 'don't be silly. Never happened'. And in a survey published in December 2016 of more than 3,000 UK Muslims, only 4% of those interviewed believed that Al Qaeda was responsible for 9/11. Bear in mind these would have been the opinions in many cases of educated Muslims, some the so-called 'pillars' and 'role models' of a 'community' that multiculturalists enthused about and politicians never tired of praising for its immense and varied contributions to British society, a community which on the

commendably honest testimony of one of its members, seethed with hatred against the Jews and lived in a make-believe world of collective denial where Muslims were always the victims of infidel, usually Jewish conspiracies. A survey of UK Muslim attitudes released in April 2016 and featured on Channel Four TV confirmed the personal testimony of Mehdi Hassan. More than a quarter of UK Muslims questioned believed that Jews caused most wars, compared with 6% for the UK as whole. No less than 40% believed that the Jews, who comprise 0.2% of the world's population compared to 22% for Muslims, exert 'too much control over world affairs', compared to 10% of the whole UK population, clear evidence, if the belief were true, of a world Jewish conspiracy. A third of UK Muslims thought the Jews had too much power and exploit the Holocaust (insofar as it happened) to their own advantage, compared to 6% for the UK as a whole. In each of these cases, it is obvious that a sizable proportion of the UK percentages holding these opinions was comprised of Muslims, even though they accounted for less than five percent of the total UK population.

Unfortunately, the opportunity was missed to ask whether, like the Muslim Labour Councillor in Luton, they approved of the Holocaust, or like so many of their co-religionists in the Middle East, believed it never happened. It was this 'dirty little secret', only now no longer either little or secret, and as filthy as it could get, that was been embraced and recast after its own fashion by the Sharia left as the price for its collaboration with the leaders of this 'Muslim community' in their joint campaign of hate against Israel and all things Jewish. Encouraged and protected by the Corbynite ascendancy, this anti-Semitic cancer had eaten its way into the very fibre of the Labour movement, and it would need brave as well as decent men and women to resist and defeat it. At a 2016 May Day rally in Trafalgar Square, from a rostrum fronted by a huge hammer and sickle banner and a giant portrait of Stalin, Corbyn repeated yet again the false claim that 'we stand absolutely against anti-Semitism in any form' The next day, the story broke that on his own website, Corbyn, the 'friend' of Jew-killing Jihadis, and associate of Holocaust deniers and Jewish conspiracy theorists, had praised as 'an icon', to be compared with Nelson Mandela no less, a Fatah terrorist, Marwan Barghouti, convicted by an Israeli court in 2004 of plotting the murder of Jewish civilians. This was followed by the revelation that Hamas had sent a message of solidarity to their embattled champion and subsequently, a cheque for £10,000 towards Corbyn's campaign for his re-election as Labour Leader. Their message made it very clear that like its UK supporters, Hamas did not regard waging war on the Jews of Israel as terrorism, any more than it considered Labour Party members' praise of Hitler, belief in a world Jewish conspiracy and demands for the deportation of all Israel's Jews as proof of anti-Semitism:

We see his [Corbyn's] engagement as a very important statement that is also a very hit [sic] that the Zionist enemy received. Hamas is not and will not be considered a terrorist group and our struggle is reduced [i.e., confined] to the borders of occupied Palestine [that, is Israel] This is a Zionist campaign to define Labour Party leaders as anti-Semitic, a desperate move that reflects the weakness and confusion of the Zionist entity.

This, coming from a movement that in its founding Covenant, endorsed the *Protocols* and claimed to have uncovered a world Zionist conspiracy going as far

back as the French Revolution. As Mehdi Hassan said, some Muslims really did have a problem when it came to the Jews. For this very reason, given Labour's growing dependency on the Muslim vote (26 Parliamentary seats had 20% or more Muslims), and their increasing influence in the party at every level, it would have been naïve to assume the Muslim source of Labour Party anti-Semitism would have been addressed as it should have by a leadership committed to the anti-Zionist cause. Why else the entirely irrelevant insertion of 'Islamophobia' into the Chakrabarti inquiry when its sole focus was supposed anti-Semitism, if not to depict Muslims as the victims of racial and religious prejudice in the Labour Party, instead of acknowledging, as was the case that they were among its most prominent and extreme perpetrators?

Appearing before the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee's inquiry into Labour anti-Semitism (not to be confused with the Labour Party's parallel and strictly in-house investigation) Jonathen Arkush, President of the Jewish Board of Deputies got to the heart of the matter when he traced the origins of the surge of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party to the election of Corbyn as its leader:

The election of a leader who is closely associated with the Palestine Solidarity Campaign [in a statement on the campaign's website congratulating Corbyn on his election as Labour leader, he is described as a 'long-time patron of the PSC], with Stop the War, [of which Corbyn was the chairman until elected Labour Leader] with a very hostile position on Israel, very well-known and very well publicised, and someone who has thought it appropriate to meet here in the democratic mother of parliaments with terrorist organisations whose stated mission in life is to kill as many Jews and Christians as possible [presumably an allusion to Article 7 of the Hamas Charter] has clearly sent the wrong kind of message to some people. With the advent of a more leftward tilt in the leadership of the Labour Party, some people think a space has been opened up for them, or they feel emboldened to say things which previously they felt they could not say in polite society ...the impression is being given by the leader of the Labour Party of a certain reluctance to accept these issues.

Arkush told the Committee that he had asked Corbyn to agree that on reflection, his meetings with Hamas and Hezbollah had been 'inappropriate' but that he had refused to do so. To invite their leaders to address meetings in Parliament, to promote their genocidal cause in public rallies, to call these anti-Semites and genocidists one's 'friends'...none of this did the Leader of the Labour Party consider 'inappropriate'. It would also have been pertinent to ask Corbyn why, when choosing to associate with and promote movements in the Middle East that claimed to represent the Palestinian cause, he had selected two that were not only avowedly dedicated to the destruction of Israel but the murder of its entire Jewish population, and not Fatah, the PLO, and the Palestinian Authority, which even if only on paper, recognised the state of Israel and were, again, if only on paper, committed to a two-state solution to the Palestine question. A perverse preference, some might say, for someone who was always advertising his devotion to the cause of world peace.

And not just for Corbyn. Only a matter of days after Chakraborty's elevation to the House of Lords in return for services rendered, more revelations surfaced concerning her patron's anti-Semitic connections. In 2014, Labour MP Grahame Morris, Corbyn's Shadow Communities Spokesman and, not by chance, also

Chairman of the Labour Friends of Palestine, demanded of the then Prime Minister David Cameron that British Jews who had served in the Israeli Defence Force should be treated as terrorists. He had also posted on-line a picture of an Israeli flag with the caption: 'Nazi in my Village: do you see the flag fly?' Following the example set by his leader, Morris hosted events featuring anti-Semitic Muslims. One such gathering was chaired by the UK-based Palestinian journalist Sameh Habeeb who, with a fine sense of timing, chose Holocaust Memorial Day to publish an article in his *Palestinian Telegraph* denying the Holocaust ever occurred. Habeeb was also the originator of the accusation, subsequently recycled by PSC Patron and Liberal Democrat Peeress Baroness Tonge, that while carrying out relief work after the Haiti earthquake of 2010, Israel soldiers harvested the organs of its victims.

The story also broke on the same day, August 8, 2016, of Corbyn's involvement with yet another anti-Semite, the academic and *Guardian* columnist Sama Ramadan, whom the Labour leader once described as a 'fascinating [sic] great friend.' Ramadan had offered a simple and all-too-familiar explanation for his friend's troubles. His academic training led him to the only possible explanation...the Jews. Accusations of anti-Semitism could only have one source, 'backers of Israel' who were seeking to 'undermine Jeremy's support for Palestine'. As for the 172 MPs who voted no confidence in his friend's leadership, they too were 'Zionist mouthpieces'. Corbyn's office declined to comment on these revelations, a sure indication that under his leadership the Labour Party would continue to be a Safe Space for anti-Semites. While not saying so in so many words, the final report of the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee investigation into the rise of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party under Corbyn's leadership came to pretty much the same conclusion. Corbyn personally was accused of a 'lack of leadership' on the issue, rendering the Labour Party 'a safe space' [sic] for those with 'vile attitudes' towards Jews. The failure of his leadership to 'consistently and effectively deal with anti-Semitic incidents in recent years' had left the party open to the charge that 'elements of the Labour movement are institutionally anti-Semitic'.

Like many other of its critics, the Select Committee was far from satisfied with the report of the Chakraborty inquiry commissioned (reluctantly) and then praised by Corbyn. One Committee member said it was 'not worth the paper it was written on'. (However, it did earn a peerage for its author) The report had failed to deliver 'a comprehensive set of recommendations, to provide a definition of anti-Semitism [not, I suspect, an accidental omission], or to suggest ways of dealing with anti-Semitism'. As for Corbyn himself, the Committee found that his failure to deal appropriately with the issue showed that he did not fully appreciate 'the distinct nature of post-war anti-Semitism'...in other words, its assuming the guise of anti-Zionism, which as we have seen, had been one of, if not the most, of Corbyn's main preoccupations in his time as an MP.

I have a proposal, made in all seriousness, that will, if strictly enforced, go at least some way to towards identifying and combatting the sources of anti-Semitism within the Labour Party, and certainly further than the whitewash of a report cooked up by its official party enquiry. It follows the excellent example set by the US imperialist occupying forces at the end of the Second World War, when they compelled German civilians living close to Nazi concentration camps to witness at first hand the corpses and skeletal survivors of the victims of the crimes their beloved leader had committed in their names. The US forces also obliged civilians

to watch the screening of films specially made by the US army of the horrors revealed by the liberation of Nazi death camps. To make sure the message got home, civilians were conscripted by the US army to bury the tens of thousands of corpses of prisoners starved and worked to death by their tormentors, not nearly enough of whom were either beaten to death by their former captives, or shot on the spot by outraged US GIs.

Following, though of course not in every detail, the excellent example set by the US imperialists in post-Nazi Germany, what I propose is the following: The archive of film material on the Holocaust is now so comprehensive that compiling a representative documentary, say of some two hours' duration, on the practical consequences of anti-Semitism should present no technical difficulties. I suggest that it begins with that part of Hitler's speech to the Reichstag on January 30, 1939, in which he announced to the world the fate he had in store for the Jews, and concludes with footage of the various Nazi death camps that were the scene of the Final Solution. All current Labour Party members would be required to attend at least one screening, at a suitable venue to be chosen by each local Constituency Party. Time should be set aside for questions and discussion on the content of the film. There will be as many showings as are necessary to ensure that all members have the opportunity to attend. New members would likewise be required to attend such viewings. Any member who refused or failed to attend such a screening would be automatically and instantly expelled from the party for life, with no right of appeal. Once the screening programme has been set in motion, all subsequent expressions of hostility towards the Jews involving comparing them with Nazis, accusing them of genocide, calling for the destruction of the state of Israel, denying the Holocaust and the right of Israel to exist (as distinct from criticism of its policies and of Judaism), and involvement in any activities with organisations or individuals which subscribe to any of these anti-Semitic propositions, would also be met with immediate expulsion for life with no right of appeal. All members so expelled would have their names published, together with the reason or reasons for their expulsion. If these proposals were to be adopted, they would undoubtedly leave Labour, at least for a while, a smaller party. But it would also be a much cleaner one.

